DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 032 937 24 PS 002 203

By-Alexander, Robert; And Others

Development of a Theatre Arts Curriculum for Young Children. CAREL Arts and Humanities Curriculum Development Program for Young Children.

Central Atlantic Regional Educational Lab., Washington, D.C.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
Bureau No-BR-6-2938
Pub Date Jun 69
Contract-OEC-2-7-062938-3058
Note-57p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.95
Descriptors-Acting, *Curriculum Development, Dramatics, Drama Workshops, Facilities, Kindergarten, Primary Grades, *Program Descriptions, *Theater Arts

A curriculum on theater is presented in this volume prepared by the Central Atlantic Regional Educational Laboratory (CAREL) Arts and Humanities Curriculum Development Program for Young Children. Topics in the 23 page Rationale section range from theories of cognitive development to an extensive explanation of the workshop concept which is recommended as the basis of the theater curriculum. The workshop should emphasize creative problem solving in an atmosphere of human interaction without authority-imposed discipline or instructor approval-disapproval. The workshop experience should be child-oriented to permit each child to proceed at his own rate, and should teach processes and methods of working rather than facts. The authors outline their proposed program of teacher preparation, involving summer sessions and an academic year apprenticeship. Theatrical lighting, props, student-teacher ratio, coaching, and evaluation are explored. Specific suggestions for workshop activity and improvisations are made. Finally, although the pilot project was unable to secure many of the conditions considered essential to an effective theater program, the original recommendations were confirmed. (MH)

ED032937

BR-6-2938
PA-24
OE/BR

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Development of a Theatre Arts Curriculum for Young Children

by
Robert Alexander
Steveanne Auerbach
Norman Gevanthor
Kenneth Kitch

CAREL Arts and Humanities Program

PS002203

Central Atlantic Regional Educational Laboratory
1200 Seventeenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

June 1969

This paper was published pursuant to contract OEC 2-7-062938-3058 between the Central Atlantic Regional Educational Laboratory and the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Table of Contents

Rationale 1

Teacher Preparation 24

The Schools - Curriculum 27

Evaluation 38

Conclusions and Recommendations 43

Appendix

FOREWORD

This is one of a series of six volumes which report on Phase One of the CAREL Arts and Humanities Curriculum Development Program for Young Children. Volumes two through six -- respectively for visual arts, dance, literature, music, and theatre -- document Phase One details of the rationale and approach, teacher preparation program, curriculum development and contents, evaluation findings, and recommendations for the future. The first volume is an overview of the entire program and outlines recommendations for Phase Two.

The U.S. Office of Education funded CAREL to complete Phase One which lasted two years, ending on May 31, 1969. For each component, this included exploratory studies; the preliminary development of curricula materials, objectives, and strategies; preparation programs for classroom teachers; classroom tryouts and evaluation of the preliminary curricula; and preparation for controlled pilot testing in the schools. For these purposes, CAREL prepared 48 classroom teachers to teach one art component each, and explored each of the arts singly, with 2,809 pupils in 27 CAREL field schools for approximately a year.

These programs in the arts and humanities were truly innovative in both content and scope. Two of the five components -- dance and theatre -- did not even exist in most American schools. The other three existed, but in generally limited programs which did not nearly meet the expressed needs of pupils.

Each component discovered that most students were constrained, restricted, and lacked interest in their usual school roles as recipient learners and repositories of information. The CAREL program developed new roles for students. They could become explorers of the full range of each art form, creative and expressive artists, poets, writers, composers, and performers; they were respected as audiences, critics, and evaluators with valid feelings, imaginations, and ideas. They were trusted and encouraged to play orchestral and exotic instruments, to use recording equipment and cameras, to work with professional quality art materials, and to express their own poetry and stories in their own language. Teachers became guides with available knowledge, skills, and resources to help students solve their own problems with their own creativity.

The results were almost instantaneous in terms of student excitement and eager involvement. They could be "turned on" within minutes by personal interest and pride in their new roles. And as exploring, creative, and expressive self-educators, they also learned more of the classical information and skills than they ever did in their former roles as recipients and repositories. Now, for example, a pupil asked his music teacher how

great composers had solved certain problems in beginning a composition. The pupil then listened to classical recordings for the answers and considered them for his own composition. This was very much different from listening to the beginning of classical recordings to memorize answers for a test.

Much remains to be done to develop and refine the CAREL curricula and especially the preparation programs for classroom teachers. But the CAREL "way of learning" can provide the essential pupil energy needed for further curriculum development, energy in the kind of pupil interest and excitement that accompany his musical composition, his work of art, his poem or story or improvised dramatic role.

Due to the lack of funds, CAREL can not continue into Phase Two. However, it is hoped that the information and findings of these CAREL studies will enable and enhance the continuation by others into the next phase of an arts and humanities curriculum development program for young children.

Martin Dishart, Ph.D.
Program Director

RATIONALE

The purpose of this paper is to describe and demonstrate the desirability of theatre workshops for the primary grades. There is mounting evidence, albeit much of it still lacking scientific evaluation, that improvisational workshops in acting (or derivatives of such workshops) are powerful means of self-identification and self-realization, and, because of the nature of the workshop process, exert a strong influence toward organic socialization - that is, a socialization arising out of the necessity for cooperation which the work demands.[1] This is true because of the nature of theatrical art, for theatre is both an imitation of and a structured intensification of the life process - the business of living from day to day. It is the nature of acting, and the theatre in general, that when involved in it one is always dealing with other human beings, and not simply with abstract concepts such as might occur in, say, a mathematics class, nor solely with subjective reality or experience such as might be the case when one writes a poem or paints a watercolor. In the latter situations, one may deal with other human beings; in the acting workshop one must, for the single most important function of the theatre is to reveal the human condition in terms of human interaction on its deepest level. Of all the arts, theatre clearly has the most unabashed disregard for the philosophical problem of solipsism, even when, as in Beckett's play Krapp's Last Tape, it deals with that problem as a theme.

A workshop in theatre is valuable to the primary grades student beyond the potential it has to teach him to act, or to learn theatrical skills; the nature of the work renders it extendible into the other areas of the child's living and learning experience. This is due to the fact that it concentrates on:

a. Tuning the instrument. An actor's instrument is himself; his body, voice, intellect and emotional makeup. An actor must be more sensitive to his environment, inner and outer, than most non-actors are, or perhaps care to be. An actor must learn to live in the moment of experience; his receptors must be sensitized. He must make the discovery that there is no acting "product" apart from acting process; in so doing he will discover that there is no life product apart from life process.

b. Interaction with other human beings. The actor is not a solipsist; he must solve problems which involve conflict or cooperation with other people. By assuming another character, he gains insight and empathy into the personalities of other human beings.

---

[1] So called "psycho-drama" and "socio-drama" are applications of improvisational acting techniques in the areas of psychology and sociology. Carl Rogers' "encounter groups" are another example, and while they may not be derivative, they are certainly similar in several ways to improvisational acting techniques. The Arena Stage Curriculum Enrichment Program, a teacher training program which centers around acting workshops, is currently under observation by the National Institute of Mental Health, presumably out of interest in its ortho-psychiatric potential.

c. The solution to artistic problems which is creativity. While it may be impossible to "teach" creativity, it is not impossible to set up conditions, pose problems, and suggest methods of working which will encourage rather than inhibit its growth in human beings. The acting workshop is designed for this purpose.

The nature of "creativity" has been the subject of much speculation. Why are some minds capable of conceptualizing and realizing experience in a "new" way? Anyone could have dropped weights from the tower of Pisa; why did generation after generation instead accept a "self-evident" rationalization easily refutable by experience?

It is our belief that every human being, to a greater or lesser degree is capable of creative activity. This obviously does not mean that everyone can write like Tennessee Williams or dance like Martha Graham. In most instances, creativity is stifled by the myriad forces of conformity which social living implies. That is, the environment of the "average" society is inhibiting to the creative capacities of the "average" citizen. The workshop attempts to reverse this process by 1) calling attention to it, 2) creating a counter-atmosphere which is non-inhibiting and 3) developing techniques and methods of working which release rather than inhibit creative impulse. The advantage of working with young people in such a workshop is that the negative, repressive aspects of socialization have had less time to work on the individual, and the individual has had less time to "prepare a face to meet the faces that he meets" - to create the facade behind which much of the better part of his humanity may cower.

While we can provide no "final" definition of creativity, we must have a functional model from which to work. The creative process has, it seems to us, three major functional elements: heightened receptivity, a clear perception of the data of experience; assimilation and aesthetic or imaginative structure of that data; translation or codification of the whole into terms understandable by others. The results could be as varied as a performance, a poem, or a mathematical hypothesis. The methods of problem solving taught and employed in the theatre workshop are interdisciplinary, and can be applied to a variety of problems.[2]

The story of social man is a story of fragmentation, of separation of intellectual, emotional, and physical life as part of a means of creating a "survival dress" for social intercourse. The theatre workshop attempts to reintegrate the man in the belief that such integration is necessary to creative life, at least for that moment in which the creative act occurs. So much of human interaction, cogitation and communication has centered

---

[2]In the Arena Stage Curriculum Enrichment Program, for example, theatrical workshop environments and theatrical workshop techniques are used to teach non-theatrical subject matter, such as spelling and geography.

on the convenient codification afforded by language that verbalization, the handmaiden of the intellect, is often substituted for experience. The nature of art, and of creative living, demands that the artist or simply the human being penetrate the symbol to the experience beneath it. Only the whole man can solve the problem with genius; the results of the problems met with less than genius make up most of the fabric of our world. They are their own advocates for improvement.

The Art of the Theatre

The theatre, like any living thing, is difficult to categorize; what you ignore in the interest of establishing uniformity may be as important as what you emphasize to form the category. In the overview of this paper, theatre is a communal art aimed at revealing the human condition on its deepest level. At its best, theatre is a codification of human experience both on the personal and social level. The actor onstage is the representative of man, imitating his actions, embodying his aspirations, expressing his joy, his fear, his hatred, celebrating what has been called "the human comedy". His relationship with the audience is one-to-one, for the line between the actor and each spectator is geometrically direct; when the actor/audience communication is at its best, it is emotionally direct as well. Theatre gives man back his image and experience in a form structured by artistic vision. Theatre is like life, only more so.

Theatres in the formal sense - a building with seats and a "picture frame" or other type of stage - are demonstrably non-essential to some societies; one can point to many periods of history where the theatre as we know it today, with its written script, its managerial and support personnel, directors and musicians, did not exist. Of all the elements of the theatre, the one seemingly most essential - because there is no period in history in which it does not exist - is the actor, if by that we can agree to mean the human expression of the mimetic urge itself, the urge to imitate, to mime, to play. Historically, one can point to the Commedia del Arte, a form of improvised theatre which played in the streets, and which evolved into a very high art form bearing very little formal resemblance to the Italian theatre of the Renaissance which preceded it. "Institutional" theatre virtually disappeared from Italy, but the urge to imitate, communicate, and entertain through the imaginative representation of human action did not. Furthermore this improvised theatre succeeded in commenting on the human condition through the creation of generic characters - types - easily recognizable (and equally enjoyable) today.

This paper has neither the scope nor the purpose of detailing the origins of the theatre itself. There are many excellent texts on this subject, one of which is listed in the bibliography. We wish only to emphasize here that the art of the theatre in its most fundamental form - mimesis - has existed in every age and every culture since the dawn of recorded history, and in its ritualistic or religious functions undoubtedly extends back to the origins of human tribal society.

"Birds fly, fish swim, man thinks and learns", says John Holt in emphasizing the naturalness of the learning process to the child.[3] He might have added "Man plays", for so he does, and always has, and always will. He is a natural game player, a mime, an imitator of himself and a creator of spirits out of himself. His play can express the deepest anguish and the greatest joy; it can repeat with fidelity the simplest life action, or embody the subtlest and most abstract thought.

The fundamental unit of the theatre art is the actor, because he embodies the mimetic urge basic to the art. We think it appropriate that an organic approach to theatre begin with an emphasis upon the actor; a course in theatre for the young should encourage and nourish the natural mimetic impulses of children.

Toward a Theory of Acting

There is no single theory of acting; rather the theories vary from culture to culture and even theatre to theatre. While acting is normally thought of as a part of theatre, it is possible to act in an un-theatrical context, either for extra-theatrical purposes such as "role playing" in the business world, or out of ignorance of the theatrical context, such as young children playing "house" in a back yard. It is not necessary to stand on a stage before an audience to act; the theatre needs acting, but acting does not necessarily need the theatre. It is therefore possible to begin the teaching of acting without emphasizing "production" - the end product of institutionalized theatre.

Our approach to the art of acting is an organic approach, consistent with our feeling that the art is native to the human animal. The organic approach to the portrayal of character in the theatre is not new; it developed concomitantly with experiments in literary and dramatic realism characteristic of Gerhart Hauptmann, Henrik Ibsen, and other late nineteenth-early twentieth-century dramatists, including the more subtle studies of human character and social dilemma contained in the plays of Anton Chekhov. Chekhov was fortunate enough to find a theatre "ready" for his plays, that is, ready to undertake the experiments in production under the direction of Konstantin Stanislavsky which would make Chekhov's name synonymous with great modern drama, and Stanislavsky's with the famous - and much abused - "Method", a method of acting evolved in the production of these and other plays at the Moscow Art Theatre. Simply put, this method emphasized the idea that the actor should believe in the action he is playing and experience the emotion which it produces; the actor must find a way of relating his own personality to the personality of the character he is portraying. Numerous exercises were invented to aid in this process, including the famous sense and emotion memory exercises - techniques for the powerful recall of sensory

---

[3]John Holt, How Children Learn. (New York: Pitman, 1967), p. 189.

and emotional experience. The experiments of Konstantin Stanislavsky were really experiments in human motivation and behavior, and they came at a time when many other motivational experiments - including those of Sigmund Freud - were taking place. Stanislavsky reasoned that if one could understand why people act the way they do, one could better distill and imitate those actions on the stage. The Moscow Art Theatre rehearsals were, in part at least, inquiries into the workings of the human mind.

The company of the Moscow Art Theatre was not alone is this experimentation; the famous company of the Duke of Saxe-Meinengen, Antoine's Theatre Libre, and others, particularly those devoting or dedicating themselves to the production of the new, realistic drama, were making their own contributions. None, however, produced such consistently impressive work or evolved such a clear statement of working theory as the Moscow Art.

It was this same period in theatre history when the director emerged as a dominant force in theatrical production. It is interesting to note that the director emerged not as a "master schemer" or coordinator, but rather as a person whose overview of the entire play and its action enabled him to help the actor make the discoveries - and select intelligently from them - relevant to the actions and emotions the actor was expected to portray. There were exceptions or variations even within the Moscow Art Theatre itself - the work of Meyerhold and Vakhtangov in the studios emphasized a broader theatricality based on strong directorial concepts and constructivist, non-realistic stage environments.[4] There was even experimentation with human or actor mechanics, called "bio-mechanics" in which human gesture was abstracted and related theoretically to emotion in a series of elaborate postures and exercises. Nevertheless, in the years since this early experimentation, the organic approach has emerged as the principal means of character building, and of play directing as well. The basic texts and chronicles of the approach - Stanislavsky's An Actor Prepares, Building A Character, My Life in Art, Gorchekov's Stanislavsky Directs, Michael Chekhov's To The Actor, Boleslavsky's Acting, The First Six Lessons, Sonya Moore's The Stanislavsky Method, and C. J. McGaw's Acting Is Believing - are highly regarded today.

Furthermore, the dominant American schools of acting emphasize the same approach - the Actors' Studio, The Neighborhood Playhouse, Stella Adler, The Actor's Lab, and numerous private teachers of acting.

As the drama turned from the realism characteristic of the turn of the century, and developed along more imaginative and fluid lines, actors and directors discovered that the organic approach in acting continued to work; the same approach to the portrayal of character used in Miss Julie could be used in A Dream Play, or R.U.R., or Mother Courage, or Waiting for Godot. A method which will work in many situations is a sound method, and this one, developed over the last seventy-five years of European and American theatrical experimentation and production, is the one we propose to teach.

PS 002203

---

[4]Constructivism concentrates on a visual and mechanical equivalence for a point of view or overall idea about the play (usually the director's) rather than upon the creation of a realistic environment.

What Should Be Taught?

A General Statement of Purpose and An Important Distinction

In the teaching of any art, a careful distinction must be drawn between those qualities essential to the art itself, and formal or accidental qualities characteristic of the art as practised in a given culture at a given time. There is a severe misapprehension of this distinction on the part of many theatre educators. As a result, outmoded, idiomatic techniques long since relegated to the history books by the practising theatre are sometimes taught as "essentials".[5] This is an error easily avoided. Based on what we have said above concerning the nature of theatre and the nature of acting, we can select an element around which to design a curriculum dealing with the fundamentals, the mutations of which form the idioms of a given day.

This element is the human urge to imitate, to "act". Theatre is only one outgrowth of this urge; mimesis has served a variety of functions in the history of man, including the magical and religious functions of which there are so many examples.[6] All human beings have this urge; in

---

[5]One of us recently had the occasion to act as judge in a competition of play productions by young children under the auspices of the Washington, D. C., Recreation Department. Several groups of young people had prepared productions of varying degrees of elaborateness for the occasion. One was an incredibly detailed reconstruction, presumably unwitting, of a 1930's production of Oedipus The King, complete with tiny togas and sandals and high sounding phrases coached with the semblance of understanding from really uncomprehending minds and lips. It was a product sure to please the adult heart which bore little or no relation to the children involved except insofar as it represented an elaborate appeal for kind judgement. It nearly succeeded. Most of the co-panelists thought it clever - "amazing what those youngsters could do." Our choice fell upon an original work - written, directed, and acted by another group of children (under what had apparently been some very constructive and non-intrusive supervision). It looked definitely off-Broadway by comparison with the Greek play, which gave the impression of having been backed by David Merrick. But it was an effort which was connected in form and content with the children who were doing it. It was theirs, they could and did relate to it as something which contained meaning for them and to which they could add meaning and dimension. We were, by dint of an impassioned appeal, able to secure the judgement in favor of this entry, since it showed so clearly the distinction between the living qualities of dramatic art, and those elements which amount to imitation in its worst sense.

[6]In almost every instance, theatre has grown out of mystical or religious exercise. The Greek theatre is an obvious example. The origins of the English theatre are usually found in the Quaem Quaeritus trope of the Catholic church. Sir James G. Frazier's The Golden Bough contains endless examples of theatrical rituals in pagan cultures.

the natural play of children it is often quite highly developed and structured. A course in theatre should accept this organic starting point and develop from it by means of guided improvisation. All of theatre - the acting, directing, the design, and an understanding of the play itself - can be extrapolated from this base. What we are suggesting is that in order to learn the theatre, the child should be helped, encouraged, and allowed to reinvent it. Jean Piaget has said, "Even in order to understand we have to invent, or that is, to reinvent, because we can't start from the beginning again. But I would say that anything is only understood to the extent that it is reinvented."[7] As educators we must devise a means of offering the help, encouragement, and permission necessary for reinvention to occur. That means, for a course in theatre, is the acting workshop.

The acting workshop is discussed in detail below; essentially it consists of the playing of relevant improvisational games in a non-judgemental atmosphere in which the student/actor is free to explore all the possibilities of a given character or situation. The cardinal rule of the workshop is that it is impossible to be wrong; that is what we mean by non-judgemental. The process of invention - discovering or making something hitherto unknown to mankind - and of reinvention - discovering or making something hitherto unknown to the individual - are similar processes. Both inevitably include that which, to an outsider, looks like waste motion. It must be understood that "waste" is essential to and part of the creative process, whether one discovers radium or plays Hamlet. "Waste", in the common sense, has no meaning for the creative act, for the "blind alley" and the "false start" are part of a means of assimilating and arranging information which leads, ultimately, to the symbolic codification of artistic - or scientific - expression. Symbolic codes grow out of a felt need to objectify experience. Other people's symbols do not necessarily contain meaning for us, unless we understand the process through which they were generated. John Holt remarks that "the only way children can learn to get meaning out of symbols, to turn other people's symbols into a kind of reality or a mental mode of reality, is by learning first to turn their own reality into symbols. They have to make the journey from reality to symbol many times, before they are ready to go the other way."[8] To allow the child to reinvent - which is to allow him to learn -

---

[7]Frank G. Jennings, "Jean Piaget: Notes on Learning," Saturday Review, May 20, 1967, p. 83.

[8]Holt, p. 181. In the entry of November 8, 1963 (p. 50) in How Children Learn, Holt describes a cello experiment which sheds some light on "waste motion" and the discovery process. He took a cello into the classroom, and, rather than telling the students what it was, or how to bow or finger it, merely let them "mess about" with it. In watching their experiments, he remarks: "It doesn't take a child long, by such steps to grasp the basic idea of the cello, the relationship of the bow, the string, and the left hand. But while he has been figuring this out, he has been ceaselessly active. One could say that he is having too much fun - a weak word, really - playing the cello to want to take time to figure it out. A scientist might say that,

requires patience, and resistance to the adult impulse to speed things up by imposing a discipline - which may be a valid discipline, but which is as yet undiscovered by the child. It requires attention to process rather than to result.

To teach a course in theatre, then, we propose to begin with acting, an element essential to the art, and teach it by doing it; by helping, or merely allowing the student to get in touch with himself, with his body, with his physical environment, with his classmates, and to release or allow free play for his mimetic impulses. We must encourage full participation in the creative process itself, not simply imitation or observation of the creativity of others. We must, in short, encourage the student to reinvent for himself the symbolic representation of Man which is theatre. From that base we can lead him to a participation in, and appreciation of, the discoveries of others.

Who Is the Student?

It seems appropriate, before describing a method of instruction, to attempt some description of the person - the student - whom we are attempting to teach. It has become increasingly apparent in the last few years that a method of instruction unrelated to at least a working model of the patterns or processes of cognitive growth in the human being can only be accidentally effective. There might be a fortunate coincidence with the developmental process at a given stage, but in the absence of such fortunate coincidence, such a method can work against cognitive growth processes, even to the point of forcing the child to replace them with unnatural responses needed to cope with the curriculum and the method of its presentation. Much of the speculation and experimentation in the field of cognitive growth stems from the work of Jean Piaget and the Rousseau Institute in Geneva. Piaget is primarily an epistemologist and psychologist rather than a curriculum designer or theorist. Consequently his work has formed the basis for an increasing number of derivative works on curriculum design and pedagogical theory. In the United States, such second generation theorizing extends, in ascending order of stringency, from John Holt through Jerome Bruner, whose Toward A

---

along with his useful data, the child has collected an enormous quantity of random, useless data. A trained scientist wants to cut all irrelevant data out of his experiment. He is asking nature a question, and he wants to cut down the noise, the static, the random information, to a minimum, so that he can hear the answer. But a child doesn't work that way. He is used to getting his answers out of the noise. He has, after all, grown up in a strange world where everything is noise, where he can only understand and make sense of a tiny part of what he experiences. His way of attacking the cello problem is to produce the maximum amount of data possible, to do as many things as he can, to use his hands and the bow in as many ways as possible. Then, as he goes along, he begins to notice regularities and patterns. He begins to ask questions - that is, to make deliberate experiments. But it is vital to note that until he has a great deal of data, he has no idea what questions to ask, or what questions there are to be asked.

Theory of Instruction[9] is a concerted attempt to design a method of instruction which coincides with cognitive development in the child.

Several important assumptions are possible, based on the theory and experiments of Piaget: One, that children do not learn through a gradual, linear accretion of "knowledge" or even skills; but in jumps or steps which may represent the falling into place of information in the mind. Second, that they exhibit an amazing and little understood capacity for "teaching themselves" - for assimilating and ultimately organizing information which is in some way useful to them. Third, that there is a factor of "readiness" to learn which corresponds to the learning "steps", which is predictable only on the most general level. There is a wide divergence of opinion on the nature of "readiness"; Piaget (and Holt) think that it is a state best not "induced" since it is so little understood. Bruner believes that it is a cultural phenomenon and that there is little harm in accelerating it.

All agree on three or four rather loosely demarked stages of development ranging from simple sensory and linguistic operations through the development of simple and then more complex motor and linguistic skills, to a stage roughly coincident with puberty when symbolic representation of reality and hypothetical reasoning become important to the developing child.

In How Children Learn, John Holt points out that our knowledge of the function and development of the human mind is so slight that to attempt to manipulate it is presumptuous - or even dangerous. We must devise a method of instruction which, at least, does not interfere with its operation. Children, Holt argues, have a natural style of learning which may vary from child to child; it is difficult or impossible for the highly developed mind of the adult to appreciate its workings.

The children for whom this course is intended range in age from five to eight, years which span one of the major developmental changes in the mind of the child. In Piaget's terms, it is during this period that the child would pass from the "preoperational" stage where most of the language formation takes place, to the stage of "concrete operations", when motor skills are developed and the solution to physical problems becomes easier. Bruner refers to the change from "enactive" to "iconic" modes of operation: from a model of the world related only to action to one employing sensory organization and the use of "summarizing images".[10]

---

[9]Jerome Bruner, Toward A Theory of Instruction, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1966).

[10]Bruner, p. 11.

Clearly, any curriculum or method of instruction for this age group would have to be flexible enough to accommodate this major shift in cognitive process in the developing child. Ideally, it would provide support and encouragement for the change. However, since we not only do not know how, but even when it takes place in a given individual, we should not be concerned about causing it to happen. It is also clear that this major change, as well as many minor ones, will not take place at the same time in every child; therefore the maximum of attention to each child is a necessity.

The mystery of the workings of the human mind, adult or child, is unsolved. The best of our theorists are only on the threshold of that vast, unknown territory. Yet, if one presumes to teach, one must have some idea - if no more than a working model - of the organism one is attempting to teach. As professionals in the theatre, we must leave the quest for certainty and the ever more elaborate models of the human thought process to experts, acknowledged and yet to come, in the field of cognitive science. At the same time, we must get on with our work, at least part of which is to foster and encourage the creative mimetic impulses of the young - that is to teach our art, if we can even presume that art is teachable. Emanuel Kant once remarked that, "Again and again it is necessary to make a decision on the basis of knowledge sufficient for action but insufficient to satisfy the intellect." It is on this basis, working with an imperfect model of the developing mind of the child, and attempting to keep our own strategy and methodology supple enough to yield to its varied and sometimes surprising manifestations, that we are able to proceed.

Much of our data is empirical, and comes from several sources. One source is our work in the public schools of Washington, D. C. over the past two years in our Curriculum Enrichment Program. In this program we seek to apply theatrical techniques to the teaching of the normal school curriculum. Most of these techniques involve exercises designed to foster sensory expansion and to free the creative impulses of the individual participants. The Curriculum Enrichment Program is designed to help the teachers free their own apparatus - their sensory equipment, their voices and their minds - so that they may enter fully into the teaching process, which is or should be an energetic human exchange between teacher and student. Many of these exercises are used with adults for the simple purpose of trying to overcome their fear of self-exposure - we call such individuals "tight" in the theatre. The children in the classrooms are more willing participants in this process, and indeed are less "tied up" than their adult counterparts either in the classroom or in the theatre. Another vast and important bank of empirical experience stems from our work with actors, many of whom evince as adults the advanced stages of sensory and psychic withdrawal which socialization extracts from most individuals as part of the price of growing up. Such withdrawal is extremely limiting, not to say destructive, to the art of acting - and to art in general.

We believe with John Holt that the child is willing and eager to learn. Furthermore, as we design a course specifically for the teaching of theatre to the young, we are aware that the child - particularly the very young child - actually exists in a state of freedom and lack of shame or fear of self-exposure which is very close to that state which many of the techniques of improvisational theatre are designed to produce in adults. That is, many of the techniques a director uses to help free the creative impulses of a mature actor are techniques to produce a feeling of the same freedom to experiment - to play - that he once possessed as a child. In creating a work of art, anything must be possible at the outset. The artist must be free to experiment, to pursue unproductive avenues of exploration, to discover for himself that those avenues are unproductive, and in general to live in an atmosphere which allows the free play of his creative instincts. The artist must push back the parameters of thought and the restrictions on possibility which the process of socialization instills in most human beings as they develop into adulthood. In the young child, many of these repressive factors have not had time to operate. He can play games freely, and with absorption and belief in a way that makes most mature actors jealous. He is capable of entering fully into an imaginary environment and, at the same time, cope with the real environment; we have observed the child totally engaged in an imaginative game break out of the framework of that game to answer a call from his mother and immediately enter into the game again with something approaching total absorption. This process equates on an unconscious level with the task - the skill and the art - which the mature actor or director must perform on a conscious level. Someone once commented that the play of natural lively children is the infancy of art. It is this freedom to create, this willingness to believe without confusing the play and the reality, and this uninhibited expression of emotion even in an imaginary situation which form the foundations of the creative process of drama. Our job as educators is to see that these impulses are not lost, and to help each child retain them and bring them under his control as he matures into a conscious, creative individual. "The world of reality has its limits, the world of imagination is boundless," so said Jean Jacques Rousseau. The child knows this instinctively; we must help him retain it, and help him learn to shape it to his own uses.

The Workshop Concept

The entire course in theatre should be organized around the workshop concept. One of the most important elements of this concept is a non-judgemental atmosphere, an atmosphere free of imposed values and arbitrary goals, an atmosphere in which, eventually, moments of spontaneous expression may be lived. Within this atmosphere improvisational games, the bulk of workshop activity, are played. Neva Boyd, pioneer worker in the field of improvisational games, says:

> Games are the organized accumulation of play behavior, and since play behavior is centered largely in the thalmic region of the nervous system, and therefore closely related to the outside world, every player has access to the stimulation of the dynamic process, and of necessity gets values out of his own experience. Because this is true, any attempts to set up values as goals for the players would tend to defeat the possibility of their experiencing these values spontaneously.[11]

Within the workshop the teacher becomes a teacher/director, and the child becomes the student/actor. The relationship should be the same as that between the actor and director in an adult workshop; this means that the teacher must respect the individuality of the child, and must not set arbitrary guidelines for the work/discovery process, nor arbitrary standards of conduct for the child which do not relate directly to the work. The discipline of acting - and it is a fantastic discipline - arises directly from the demands of the work, and is a function of the heightened concentration which the actor must achieve in order to find the reality or the psychological equivalent for the reality of the moment he is portraying - or living. It ends in the production of a great orderliness which is artistic economy, and which reflects itself in seemingly peripheral areas - such as respect for materials and for other actors. Most important for the teacher/director of younger student/actors to remember is that discipline does not equate with silence or some kind of deportment. In fact we can expect creativity to produce noise - and sometimes erratic conduct, for spontaneous expression has no book of rules. Discipline is a product of focused activity. Discipline is a function of work. Neva Boyd comments:

> The discipline of making judgements, often instantaneously, and of acting upon them within the static frame of reference i.e., the verbalized rules, is unique to the playing of games. While the game is an imaginatively set up structure into which the players project themselves psychologically, they act consistently with the demands of the situation, and thereby subject themselves to self-imposed discipline, which involves many aspects of social behavior.[12]

If a "discipline problem" exists, it is almost always a failure of the teacher/director to focus - and sometimes permit - creative activity on the part of a given individual.

---

[11]Neva Boyd, Handbook of Games, (Chicago: H.T. FitzSimons Co., 1945); in microfilm-xerography edition, (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1967), quoted from the Foreword.

[12]Neva Boyd, quoted from the Foreword.

Viola Spolin, in her famous book Improvisation For The Theatre, asks, "How can we have a 'planned' way of action while trying to find a 'free' way?" She goes on to comment "The answer is clear. It is the demands of the art form itself that must point the way for us, shaping and regulating our work and reshaping all of us as well to meet the impact of this great force."[13] Her conclusion is that the workshop is a "system" which meets the demands of flexibility necessary to the teaching of dramatic art. In such an atmosphere, teaching by rote is impossible; it is impossible because "facts" are irrelevant to creative exploration. The teacher/director must recognize and foster activity and understanding on the intuitive level. Miss Spolin defines intuition as denoting "...that area of knowledge which is beyond the restrictions of culture, race, education, psychology, and age; deeper than the 'survival dress' of mannerisms, prejudices, intellectualisms, and borrowings most of us wear to live out our daily lives." She continues, "Let us rather embrace one another in our basic humanness and strive in the workshops to release this humanness in ourselves and our students. Here, then, the walls of our cage, prejudices, frames of reference, and predetermined right and wrong dissolve. We look with an 'inward eye'. In this way there will be no fear that a system [i.e., method of working - authors] becomes a system."[14]

The workshop is organized around the work which is to take place in it. The basis of this work is the improvisational game. Improvisational techniques are useful not only in acting exercises, but, as we will point out, in scenic design, play-making, and all the related skills of the theatre. Some of us have had extensive experience in working with young people, ranging in age from five to eighteen, teaching acting in improvisational workshop situations.[15] In most instances, the design of the workshop has been that suggested by Viola Spolin, with some modifications. The workshops and improvisations are organized around four basic principles, outlined in Chapter II of Improvisation For The Theatre. They are. Problem Solving, Point of Concentration, Side Coaching and Evaluation.

Problem Solving: Viola Spolin comments:

> The problem solving technique used in workshop gives mutual objective focus to teacher and student. In its simplest terms, it is giving problems to solve problems. ...Since there is no right or wrong way to solve a problem, and since the answer to every problem is prefigured

---

[13]Viola Spolin, Improvisation for the Theatre, (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1963), p. 18.

[14]Spolin, pp. 19-20.

[15]See brief biographical notes in appendix.

> in the problem itself (and must be to be a true problem), continuous work on the solving of these problems opens everyone to his own source and power. How a student-actor solves a problem is personal to him, and as in a game, he can run, shout, climb, or turn somersaults as long as he stays with the problem.[16]

The problem itself, as in, for example, the game of "Blob" may be as simple and focused as this: "By your actions and without using words, show another person (who is the "blob" - a form without identity) who he is." Solutions are unlimited, and each student/actor may come up with a different idea.

The Point of Concentration:

> The point of concentration is the focal point for the [improvisational] system...and it does the work for the student. It is the "ball" with which we play the game.[17]

The point of concentration in a problem gives it focus, and provides an impetus and hinge point for the creative play of the participants. It also imparts an integral discipline - organic and completely unimposed. A simple and obvious example is an improvised game of basketball using a single imaginary ball.

Side Coaching: This is the method by which the teacher/director directs and forms the improvisational game without imposing information or suggesting (however subtly) solutions to problems. "It is a method used in holding the student/actor to the Point of Concentration whenever he may have wandered away (keep your eye on the ball!)"[18] As the voice of the director, who sees the total picture, it helps to keep the stage reality alive for the actor; in order to be effective, it must arise out of the activity which is taking place. The teacher/director must himself be involved with the process, and must use his own creative impulses in becoming a part of the experience - a creative participant - and not an outside observer.

> Because it is a further method of keeping the student and teacher relating and must therefore be objective, great care must be taken to see that it does not disintegrate into an approval/disapproval involvement instead - a command to be obeyed![19]

---

[16]Spolin, p. 20.

[17]Spolin, p. 22.

[18]Spolin, p. 28.

[19]Spolin, p. 29.

Side coaching should be supportive and suggestive rather than critical. In practice, side coaching can be a direct calling out of suggestions or ideas. For example, in the game "How Old Am I", in which the student/actor seeks to portray a person much older or younger than himself, the teacher/director might direct him to "feel the age in your knees," or "feel the age in your middle". Much more specific information can be given as well. For example, the environment can be changed: "It's starting to rain".

Side coaching is a method of helping an individual to solve a problem by observing closely what he is doing, and suggesting supportive or stimulating ideas when his concentration or energy flags, or his interest in the improvisational situation wanes. It also "...gives the student/actor self identity within the activity because it keeps him from wandering off into isolation within his subjective world: It keeps him in present time, in the time of process."[20] Side coaching is itself something of an art, and is very difficult to do well. Our adult instincts, or, when we are working with adult actors, our directorial ones, are always to shape by criticism and simultaneous evaluation. There are adult actors who always keep one eye on the director - for signs of approval or disappointment - and are thus never really "with" the process of the scene. To act, you must live in and with the moment: any technique, either acting or directorial, which detracts from creative absorption, is intrusive and defeating. If an actor wonders "Am I doing this correctly?" he is not doing it correctly. If a director causes him to ask this question, he is not doing it correctly.

Evaluation: Evaluation is a group process which takes place after the acting team has finished working on a problem. As a group process, it allows immediate attention to the question of whether or not the problem was solved without placing the onus of "failure" on the participants. "Did we solve the problem? If so, how? If not, why not?" Focus of this group criticism must be maintained on the problem and its solution, so that personal criticism ("You shouldn't have made a face") or extraneous criticism ("Footballs don't have laces anymore") is avoided.

The same evaluative process is used in advanced acting seminars such as the Actor's Studio, where it takes the following form:

1. The actor(s) does the scene or exercise for the director and class.

2. At the end of the exercise, the actor(s) explains the problem which he and the other participants were attempting to solve.

---

[20]Spolin, p. 29.

3. The director and class criticise the scene or exercise on that basis only. Discussion of points not specifically stated as part of the problem (or obviously relating to the problem) are not allowed. This is because anything goes in the process of solving the problem, and if in that process some other theatrical "error" is committed (bad blocking or inaudibility, for example) which does not bear on the problem, it is considered irrelevant.

A modification of this procedure (and one often used with inexperienced actors) is for the director to pose the problem for the actors' solution, so that everyone knows the point of concentration at the outset. This makes evaluation somewhat easier, and produces fewer "surprises".[21]

The second, and equally important function of the Evaluation, is that it serves to introduce the idea of audience - of the spectator - in an organic way. Theatre is a public art; the actor does not perform for himself. His performance amounts to creative communication. In the Evaluation process the student is introduced to two important ideas: that as an actor he must "project" his work to the audience, and that as audience he must enter into a dialogue with the actor - whether verbal or not is unimportant. Being an audience is in itself a creative act, for it requires concentration and application to the solution of the same "life" problem with which the performer is engaged. The audience must, if it is a good audience, participate. Children find this relatively easy; "willing suspension of unbelief" still comes very naturally to them. Adults, on the other hand, tend to sit back and wait to be enveloped; their disappointment, when it comes, is not solely a failure of the actor.

Much of the modern theatre has turned (or returned) to the idea of a more direct audience involvement. The most famous of all improvisational theatres, The Second City (where Mike Nichols and Elaine May, among others, got their start) uses the audience to suggest situations, characters, or stories which they then act out. Many modern playwrights, such as Brecht, have broken "the fourth wall" - a term used to indicate the proscenium arch, which in many plays is treated as a transparent wall through which the audience somewhat voyeuristically gazes - and carried the action and dialogue directly to the audience. At best, it encourages active audience participation; at worst, it makes sleeping difficult. "The place for the tired businessman", remarked the noted director Harold Clurman, "is home in bed." Being an audience takes energy and application.

---

[21]At the Studio, one is sometimes surprised when the object of the exercise is revealed. We watched Estelle Parsons do one of Anne's speeches from Richard III, listening for inflection, marking the minutest gesture, and weighing the believability of the delivery. At the end of the exercise she announced that the object was to maintain eye contact with the audience during the entire monologue.

Improvisation for the Theatre contains examples of many improvisational games which focus on a variety of problems. Most of them are kinesthetic rather than verbal in character, and this is for a very special reason: the games are designed to encourage spontaneous rather than merely inventive action or response. Invention implies - even requires - cerebration, and, in practice, is usually accompanied by a great deal of verbalization which acts to dampen spontaneity. This is because, as we stated above, most individuals are "fragmented" - their mental and physical functions have become disconnected. A constant problem which a theatre director faces is the tendency of the insecure actor to "talk" his action - to tell the director what he can do, what he can't do, what he intends to do, or what should be done - usually in order to avoid doing it. The result is a blocking of spontaneous response, and the production of a "dead" character. Ratiocination requires distance or overview. Distance and overview require removal from the moment, and it is in the moment that the spontaneous act occurs. Whereas invention is a product of the intellect, spontaneity is a product of intuition and impulse; it is the impulsive response to the moment - Viola Spolin calls it an "explosion" - which improvisation is intended to cultivate.[22]

> The intuitive can only respond in immediacy - right now. It comes bearing its gifts in the moment of spontaneity, the moment when we are freed to relate and act, involving ourselves in the moving, changing world around us. Through spontaneity we are re-formed into ourselves. It creates an explosion that for the moment frees us from handed-down frames of reference, memory choked with old facts and information and undigested theories and techniques of other people's findings. Spontaneity is the moment of personal freedom when we are faced with a reality and see it, explore it and act accordingly. In this reality the bits and pieces of ourselves function as an organic whole. It is the time of discovery, of experiencing, of creative expression...[23]

> Invention is not the same as spontaneity. A person may be most inventive without being spontaneous. The explosion does not take place when invention is merely cerebral and therefore only a part or abstraction of our total selves.[24]

---

[22]Many spontaneous actions arising in the rehearsal process are incorporated into performance. The incident in "On The Waterfront" in which Marlon Brando puts on Eva Marie Saint's glove as they are walking along the street originated that way. If you've seen the film, you'll remember that moment.

[23]Spolin, p. 4.

[24]Spolin, pp. 40-41.

It is important to understand that spontaneity does not imply randomness; spontaneity is shaped by the experience - the problem - which generates it.

Spontaneous response can and often does include verbal expression, but does not depend on it. This is true even when the actor is engaged in the formal production of a play, for the life of a play is in its subtext; words are the result of human process, they are not the process itself.[25]

This discussion of the workshop process is not intended to be exhaustive. There is a growing literature on the subject, but it can only be learned through experience. And the process is never finished. Only if the teacher/director is himself engaged in artistic experimentation and growth can he expect to encourage and guide the growth of the student/actor. Most important to remember is this: We do not teach facts in the workshop, but a method of working and a method of solving problems. Our aim is to create independence in the student - even from facts. We don't have the answers; the answers are different for each individual. It is enough to find the problems, and to release the creative energies of the individual for their solutions.

Technical Theatre

Under this heading fall three broad categories of endeavor; first, the "techniques" of performance - the province of the actor; second, the "techniques" of directing - the province of the director; and third, the "techniques" of physical production - the province of the designer, technical director, and backstage crew. None of these techniques "spring from Jupiter's thigh", but all arise out of the necessities of production: consequently they are, at best, organically related to the creative process which calls the production into being. Most of them are mutable, most are also visible, and together they make up the idiom - the "style"- of a given theatre or production. We say that style is "at best" organically related to creative process because often it is not. An all-too-common occurence in the theatre (particularly the amateur theatre) is the forced marriage of a production style and an acting company and/or play to which it bears no organic ties. The result is posture, elocution, indication, and death. "Technical" theatre is an extension of the creative process dealt with in the acting workshop; it is taught in exactly the same way.

---

[25]This is not to imply that all of the games are non-verbal. There are games in which the use of language is emphasized; one very interesting one, called Gibberish Store, relates "language" and gesture. In this game, one player, speaking only "Zork" (a neologistic, late-Pleistocene dialect) must communicate to the storekeeper (who, as luck would have it, speaks only "Farge", an Early Miocene grunt) his desire to purchase a particular article. One often has this kind of experience in the off-tourist season in Europe.

A detailed description of methods of instruction in these areas is more properly the subject for a strategy; we will comment only briefly on each area here.

Acting techniques include on the one hand the training of the physical and vocal apparatus of the actor, and on the other the thorny and difficult problems of stylistic gesture and movement. The latter, except for experienced actors, and only then in a situation or play which specifically demands it, had better be left alone, for it is both Scylla and Charybdis to the neophyte. The former can be approached naturally in the workshop process. Breathing correctly can be made into a kind of game if and when breath control becomes a problem. As for body movement, Viola Spolin comments, "Body release, not body control, is what is needed for natural grace to emerge as opposed to artificial movement." The director's job is not to assign training exercises to the student/actors, but to be familiar with each student/actor's problems and to design improvisational situations in which the student will first discover the problem, and then begin to search for a solution.

Directing techniques grow out of an understanding of the acting process. Since the workshop director functions in much the same manner as the director of a play, the student/actor is constantly exposed to these processes. The key is the director's overview of the entire process, as expressed in his choosing the games, initiating the action, and keeping the focus through the device of "side coaching". After the student/actor has participated for a period of time (different for each individual) as an actor, he may be given a scene or game to side coach - the directorial function in the improvisational workshop.

Implements of physical production can be introduced into the workshop almost immediately, keeping in mind that physical production is a tangible answer to aesthetic or environmental necessity. It is senseless to teach a child what a "flat" is until he feels the necessity to hide something from view of the audience or wants to make a brick wall without bricks. When he does want to hide something from the view of the audience, he will invent a flat - or a curtain, or a leg or a box teaser or a ground row. We do not imply that one should hide the physical culture of the theatre from the student; on the contrary, one should make it available, so that it can be experimented with and used at that time when the work creates a necessity for it. Lighting instruments, as another example, have no intrinsic value; they are a means of creating focus, or mood, or location. Before theatre lighting makes sense, one must discover the necessity for focus, mood, and location.

Children use physical elements in their own play; they have no difficulty in understanding their function. The workshop should contain elements which they may use in the same manner in which they use their gleanings from attics and other sources. Physical production is a toybox.

One other point should be made in regard to the importance of elements of physical production. At about age seven, if we can believe Piaget and Bruner, the child develops from the "enactive" to "iconic" modes of cognition. In the latter, concrete operations become easier - and of heightened interest. Kinesthetic patterns are easily formed, and skills should begin to appear. Given this probability, a well stocked theatre "toybox" of props and set pieces and costumes - and the materials for the construction of new ones - is an absolute necessity.

We have said above that we were eager to expose the student to the physical culture of the theatre. In fact, we are eager to expose the student to the theatrical experience in general, for, if it is properly done, rather than dampening his spirits it will open possibilities for his own work. What he sees on stage will have organic meaning for him. "Oh yes! I've done that!"

Physical Environment and Materials of the Workshop

Ideally, the workshop should be held in a special room, not the student's regular classroom, so that he may begin to associate the physical environment with the work process. Also, this will help to avoid the atmosphere of approval/disapproval connected with many of the rooms in which his other studies take place. Materials should include props, costume pieces, scenic elements - cubes and blocks and figures the students can handle themselves - perhaps a hand-puppet theatre, and one or more tape recorders. The students should be free to use all these materials as they wish; the materials should be considered expendable (and replaceable). Backup materials - teacher aids - should include a 16 MM sound projector and a film catalogue, records and a record player, photographs and paintings of a colorful, interesting nature, and perhaps illustrated books on the theatre. The teacher/director should bring into the workshop any interesting piece of the world he or she can think of. There should be no "structured" use of the student-access materials, particularly at the outset. The teacher/director will find it impossible to suggest the variety of creative uses for the materials which the members of the workshop will themselves find. They are simply there for use in playing the games and solving the problems.

Variation in the Initial Workshops for the Young

It is our belief that workshops for the young should at the outset be modified to omit the evaluative phase of workshop procedures described above. This should be done for a "break-in" period of about five months. Evaluation is by far the most difficult of the workshop functions; it is in this phase that the spontaneity-dampening approval/disapproval mechanism

is most likely to creep in on the part of uninitiated student/actors and teacher/directors alike. The first task for the teacher/director is to help the student/actor to trust the workshop environment - it is his, but so few things in his experience with adults are his that it takes him some time to realize this. We have found this true in our workshops with children of all ages, from five to eighteen. Once a mutual trust is established, the evaluative process can be cooperative rather than competitive.

In designing a course in theatre for grades K through 3 there is no necessity for radical departure in technique, or even subject matter, for the successive academic classifications. The workshop, with gradually more sophisticated and multi-faceted problems, will always be the basis of the study. This would be true if the course were designed for K through 12; it is the method used in most of the professional theatre schools in the country, and has produced most of America's greatest actors. The student/actor studies and participates in the art and craft of the theatre, not in a "course of study".

Evaluation

In the workshop, evaluation on the part of the director is continuous. It must be, for the director's choice of workshop focus grows out of the problems and discoveries of each student/actor. For example, if a student/actor has inordinate difficulty in verbalizing, the director will involve him in problems which the student/actor will discover require verbalization. The requirement grows out of the problem; the director need not lecture or drill. Viola Spolin points out that the solution to every problem is prefigured in the problem itself. In evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of each student/actor, the teacher/director can intelligently suggest improvisations which focus on them. A written record of workshop observations should be kept by the director on a daily basis; with this aid he can more easily shape the workshop to fit the needs of the participants. We suggest the use of a tape recorder for recording these observations; this removes the obstacle of the reluctance of most individuals to sit down and write a report. The tapes can be transcribed and, if necessary, edited to form a written record.

Formal evaluation on a quarterly or monthly basis is of little use; in this sense the workshop should be non-graded. Pass/fail has no relevance here; only the teacher/director can fail. There is a way to engage the attention, interest, and free the creativity of every individual in the workshop; barring serious psychopathology on the part of a given student/actor, the director can and must find a means of engaging each individual in the work. Furthermore, formal, short term evaluation produces the very tensions and competition that the workshop is designed to eliminate; it makes little sense to construct a method of working which avoids an approval/disapproval atmosphere, and then fit it to a system of evaluation

which reverses it. Furthermore, a conscientious workshop director will find summary evaluation on a short-term basis impossible. At the Neighborhood Playhouse in New York, Sanford Meisner and his staff undertake evaluation of their students on the basis of a year's work; if Piaget and Bruner know that children learn in "steps", any director or teacher of acting can tell you that actors progress by "breakthroughs" which may be preceded by long fallow periods of seeming stagnation. Given the nature of the work, short-term evaluation is inherently absurd.

Any person other than the workshop director who evaluates the overall program must understand the work. The average teacher or supervisor or principal could not "judge" an exercise at, for example, the Actors' Studio; because they have no appreciation of the process, they can have little appreciation for the apparent form. If a judgement is required to allay fears, or justify to parents, administration, or the Federal Government the existence of a course in theatre, the "judge" should be an expert in the field - preferably a professional in theatre - who is not directly involved in the program. The recorded observations of the workshop director are the only reliable guide. Casual or "drop in" evaluators of any workshop are like the blind men and the elephant; each "sees" a different animal.

Summary

A course in theatre for grades K through 3 should answer to the following general criteria:

1. The course should be organized around the workshop principle.

2. The course should be child-oriented, and each child should be allowed to develop at his own rate.

3. The students should not be graded on their work.

4. The course should teach process and method of working, rather than idiomatic results of process or "facts".

5. The course of study should reflect, in its design, what we know of the development of the cognitive processes in the child.

It is our firm belief that the improvisational methods emphasized in the theatre workshops are extensional into areas outside the theatre. The power and subtlety of many of the seemingly most simple of the games is difficult to explain to someone who has not experienced them. As social creatures, we make ourselves like an oyster makes a pearl, layer upon layer. Peer Gynt, peeling the onion, cried out to no one in particular, "When am I going to get to the heart?" These games, properly used, cut

through the layers to reveal the human quick that is the place of genius. To be an artist is to be naked before the world - before not only our enemies, which is easy, but before our friends, and ourselves, as well. Freedom requires exposure; most of us spend our lives being jailors to our thoughts and impulses. But then, most of us don't invent quantum mechanics or create the character of Willy Loman.

There is a gradient to every process. If we can free ourselves enough, new things become possible to us. We can "act" by the rules, or we can create in the moment; we can also live our lives that way. It is our belief that the nature of life is improvisational, and that the person who can respond and act on a moment-to-moment basis is most free to create in whatever endeavor he chooses. Our art, the art of the theatre, is a magnified and focused picture of this process, and we feel that its methods are extensional into many areas of the student's life.

TEACHER PREPARATION

In the CAREL program conducted during the 1968-69 academic year, two professional teachers in theatre from Arena Stage conducted the classroom sessions. This was due to the fact that we feel that a great deal of practical experience is necessary for the workshop director. The immediate question then becomes the preparation, practice, and eventual autonomy of the non-specialist teacher. This is achieved through three methods: 1) the participation by the teacher in a training workshop wherein the teacher works as an actor under the workshop director; 2) the actual practice of workshop direction under the guidance of a master teacher, with continuing released-time workshops to be conducted by the master teacher for the classroom teachers; 3) concomitant familiarization with the theoretical and practical literature on improvisational theatre, including practical work on day-by-day workshop planning, from which personalized curriculum guidelines emerge.

Unfortunately, in the initial year of the program's operation, funds were not available either for summer workshops for teachers or for in-service released-time workshops during the academic year. In consequence, the teachers could function only as observers, and were denied the practical experience of workshop participation. In spite of this fact, two of the four teachers involved in the program demonstrated considerable capacity in understanding and use of the techniques, and carried the improvisational approach into other periods of the curriculum day. However, we do not feel that these teachers are prepared, in the absence of intensive workshop sessions, to continue the work on a significant level without adequate supervision and opportunity for further training.

An idealized schedule for the preparation of classroom teachers and master teachers follows. By classroom teacher we mean a teacher capable of teaching a course in theatre to the students under occasional observation by consultants or master teachers. By master teacher we mean a teacher capable of preparing other teachers for this work, and acting as a consultant to help them in the practical application of improvisational techniques in the classroom.

1. First Summer Session. In the first summer session a master teacher from the professional theatre conducts a workshop of three to four weeks duration, five days per week, five hours per day, for fifteen teachers. A ratio of master to student teachers should be no greater than 1 to 15.

2. First Academic Year. During the first academic year, the teachers of paragraph one begin applying the techniques learned in the summer workshops with their own students. A minimum of three curriculum hours per week must be devoted to the theatre course in order for it to be effective.

Teacher/student ratio should be kept at one to twenty or lower whenever possible. In the teacher's first year of practice, she should receive one hour of in-class observation and consultation time per week from a master teacher. In addition, she should receive no fewer than eight full released days, an average of one per month, to be devoted to continuing workshops under the master teacher. At the end of the first academic year, the following results are anticipated: 50% of the teachers participating in the sessions described in paragraphs one and two should be qualified to teach a course in theatre for the K-3 level with occasional classroom consultation or observation from a master teacher. However, it is important to emphasize that these teachers must continue to participate in released-time workshops with a master teacher - just as a professional actor or director participates in master classes to keep his work and his vision fresh. At least four released days should be devoted to this work in subsequent years. The 50% attrition rate allows both for drop-outs, transfers, or administrative shifts and for teachers who may need an additional summer workshop to prepare them for full course responsibility in the second academic year.

3. Second Summer Session. Three types of workshops are possible for the second summer session. The first would begin a new cycle with unprepared teachers under the direction of a professional master teacher as described in paragraph one. At this point the development of the first generation of master teachers may begin. This would be accomplished by a workshop that would function in the following manner: Selected candidate teachers from paragraphs one and two would function as provisional master teachers, conducting initial workshops for unprepared classroom teachers. These provisional master teachers would function under the observation of and with help from the professional master teachers in paragraph one. Thus, we feel that a maximum of 25% of the unprepared teachers who begin their preparation as described in paragraph one - the first summer session - will qualify as candidates for master teacher status in the second summer session. A third category of workshop could include those teachers from the first summer session and first academic year who require an additional summer session before they are prepared to teach the course to their students in the classroom.

4. Second Academic Year. By the second academic year, approximately 50% of the original teachers from paragraph one will be qualified to teach a course in theatre for grades K-3 in the schools. In addition, half of these teachers will be qualified to function as provisional master teacher, as they have done in the previous summer session. Provisional master teachers should receive at least eight full-day released-time workshops during the course of the second academic year. These workshops would be conducted by the original master teachers of paragraph one. The provisional master teachers would function as consultants to those teachers who began their training with the Second Summer Session. Just as with the previous

generation of classroom teachers, these "second generation" classroom teachers should receive one hour of in-class consultation per week plus eight full day released-time workshops under the direction of the provisional master teachers.

Thus, by the end of the second academic year, the course in theatre for the grades K-3 could become self-sustaining within a school system, having produced its first generation of master teachers - the provisionals of the second academic year - who will be able to begin the cycle anew in the third summer session. Also, the new generation of candidates for the status of provisional master teachers - the classroom teachers of the second academic year - will have been produced.

It should be stated that the process of identifying potential teachers of a course in theatre for grades K-3 must be very selective. Since it is an innovative approach in the teaching of theatre to the young, the work will clearly progress most rapidly in the hands of individuals who are committed to creative exploration and change in the classroom. It is especially important that supervisors and administrators understand and appreciate the philosophy and practice of such a course of instruction, so that they can provide support and encouragement to the teachers working with new and difficult techniques.

Finally, it must be clear from the above that we believe it entirely impossible for an unprepared teacher to teach a significant course in theatre from a syllabus. The quest for a "teacher proof" syllabus seems to us a futile quest - certainly, in the professional theatre, it would be regarded as ridiculous. This is not to deny that recourse and reference to source materials and curriculum guidelines is useful; such written materials are made constant use of during the training process. It is, however, to emphasize that, since we are teaching a communal art form, such materials cannot substitute for the primary human interaction which we and our colleagues in the professional theatre deem absolutely necessary to the teaching process. The written materials and the curriculum content will be discussed below.

THE SCHOOLS

Three schools were selected for application of the CAREL-Arena Stage Program. Two of them, Garrison Elementary School and Bancroft Elementary School, are located in the Cardozo Model Schools District in the inner-city of Washington, D. C. This division of the District of Columbia Public Schools was set aside in 1965 as a sub-autonomous unit for experimentation. Its prime characteristic as a model division was that it combined into one unit a geographical group of schools located in the heart of the inner-city, where the crime rate was the highest, income lowest, and the whole compound of urban problems were combined. One class of first graders from each of these two inner-city schools was selected to participate in the course.

The third school, Burning Tree Elementary School, is located in a middle to upper-middle class suburban Maryland community. Its student population is largely white, just as that of the inner-city is largely black. In this school, two classes of third grade students were selected to participate in the course on theatre.

All instruction was conducted by Robert Alexander, Director of Theatre for Children and Youth at Arena Stage, and by Norman Gevanthor, Associate Director, or occasionally by Steveanne Auerbach, in training as a professional consultant to the program and official observer and reporter on the daily sessions in the classrooms.

Only two hours per week were allotted to the course in theatre - less time than we had originally asked and, as it turned out, not truly optimum time for the application of the program. Instruction spanned the 1968-69 academic year, although the program at Burning Tree School started late due to minor administrative difficulties. In the initial weeks of the program, instruction was conducted in two one-hour sessions each week for each class. However, this was later modified into a single two-hour session per week per class. Because of the nature of the work, a certain amount of warm-up time is necessary before the work can begin on a very deep level. When the session is only an hour long, this leaves insufficient time for the development of the work and for the involvement of all the students. It has been our general experience that a one-hour session is insufficient even for adults. In consequence, our original request was for two one-and-one-half hour sessions per week in each school for a total of three hours per week. Our experience over the past academic year has confirmed our feeling that this is the minimum amount of time appropriate to this work.

Class Size. The size of the classes in all four schools averaged approximately 25. Over a period of years, we have estimated an optimum student to teacher ratio which holds for both children and adults at 15 to 1. In the interest of accommodating to the size of the average classroom, however, we agreed to enlarge this ratio significantly. Such an increase obviously decreases the amount of personal attention that the director can give to each student, an effect to be avoided if possible. But perhaps more important, it creates a workshop with too many persons to be cooperatively involved in a single exercise for sustained periods. Since all the children do not work all the time, the larger workshop means that the frequency of working is also reduced. This can result in boredom and impatience on the part of workshop participants, particularly at the first grade level. This effect may be particularly difficult for a teacher new to the work to accommodate. In short, our experience over the past academic year has reaffirmed our belief that the optimum size of the theatre workshop is 15, and that it can be stretched to twenty without serious deterioration - particularly with second or third graders - but beyond that point the size of the workshop begins to become an additional factor working toward distraction or lack of concentration with which the workshop director must deal.

Environment. The room and facilities provided for the theatre workshop varied radically from the inner-city to the suburban school. In both inner-city schools, most of the theatre workshop was done in the classroom with the chairs pushed back against the walls to create an open center space. Since the rooms were not particularly spacious, this led to a somewhat cramped environment. In addition, there were no blackout curtains provided for the showing of films and the window blinds did not function properly. The removal of the students to the auditorium, where sufficient floor space and air space was available for uninhibited movement and action, was rendered difficult by the demands on that space. No special time was allowed the theatre classes for its use, and on more than one occasion a half-hour's time was wasted in a trip to the auditorium only to find it already occupied. In general, administrative support in the inner-city schools seemed casual. In consequence, most of the workshops took place in the regular classroom. This is disadvantageous both because of the approval-disapproval atmosphere which a child associates with his regular classroom and which is inimical to creative workshop play, and because it is impossible to use properly the physical elements of the workshop - which correspond to the physical culture of the theatre. Space limitation was so severe that all of the "building block" scenic elements designed for workshop use had to be abandoned in the inner-city schools for lack of adequate floor space and storage facilities.

By contrast, and to the surprise of no one, the facilities of the suburban Maryland school were far superior. A large all-purpose room was provided for the theatre workshops. Rolling partitions which the students

could handle could be and were moved into place to create a small theatre at one end of this space. There was adequate storage for costumes, properties and scenic elements which were used extensively in the workshops. A certain amount of light control was also available, so that it was possible to create area focus for the improvised scenes. In this more relaxed environment, administrative attention and support was very good, and the teachers seemed to have the feeling that they were participating in something of significance.

Teacher Participation. In each of the four classes, the teacher participated as an observer, and when her time allowed, wrote out her impressions in the form of a report and submitted it to Mrs. Auerbach, the official program observer. Since the teachers had had no summer workshop, nor released-time or other workshops during the academic year, it was impossible for them to play a significant role in the instruction. In general, instruction was left entirely to the master teachers from Arena Stage.

Workshop Content - The Curriculum

As stated above, the teaching of the course in theatre is done entirely through a workshop process. The workshop itself is a non-judgemental environment in which the students, under the direction of the workshop director, encounter and solve artistic problems which contain learning experiences posed by the director. The workshop closely approximates and acknowledges as its model that described by Viola Spolin in her famous book, Improvisation for the Theatre, Chapter II. Elements of the workshop are problem-solving, point-of-concentration, side-coaching, and evaluation, all of which are described in some detail above. Improvisation for the Theatre is a basic resource text which we require each teacher undergoing training to read and familiarize himself with. Two other basic resource texts from which extensive excerpts may be assigned are Stanislavsky's Building a Character and Michael Chekhov's To The Actor. In addition, each teacher in the program is provided with a bibliography similar to the one appearing at the end of this paper.

The remainder of the written course material, which amounts to a curriculum guideline and an outline of the course content, is provided in the form of improvisational games and their descriptions. These guidelines are fluid and thus provide not only a reminder or "course outline" but also, because of their nature, suggest ways in which the teacher or director can develop, modify or invent new improvisational games which embody artistic problems. As a result, each director or teacher who participates in the course develops a personalized curriculum guide which he may add to, modify, and develop throughout the remainder of his professional career.

Many of the games listed below were developed in this manner. Those games published in Improvisation for the Theatre (see Bibliography No. 18) and Neva Boyd's Handbook of Games (see Bibliography No. 2), are not described, but page references to the former work are supplied.

Group A. Orientation exercises concentrating on the individual actor and on simple cooperation and communication with other actors.

1. Listening to the environment - Spolin, page 55.
2. What am I listening to - Spolin, page 55.
3. Balloon music - Alexander, Arena Stage. In this exercise the student is asked to concentrate on an orifice in his body, either imagined or real, and to allow the music which he hears to enter and fill his body much as air or gas fills a balloon. When he becomes buoyant, he is to move about the room. He is then side-coached to let the music escape, just as gas escapes from a balloon, and to follow his physical impulses under the stimulus.
4. Feeling self with self - Spolin, page 56.

5. Transformation of sounds - Alexander, Arena Stage. In this exercise one student makes a sound, the second student imitates the sound and then allows it to change, the third student takes this changed sound and repeats the process.
6. Taste and smell - Spolin, page 58.
7. Orchestra - Alexander, Arena Stage. In this exercise various sections of students are given vocal sounds and asked to represent sections of an orchestra. They must then follow the conductor's instructions concerning dynamics, etc.
8. Mirror #1 - Spolin, page 60.
9. Contact touch - Alexander, Arena Stage. In this exercise student actors face outward in a circle opposite a partner. They are side-coached to sense their partner's back, and upon impulse to turn and face the partner. Once eye contact has been established it must not be broken. The partners then move toward each other until they feel the impulse to touch, at which point the exercise ends.
10. Blind conversation - Alexander, Arena Stage. In this exercise two or more pairs of partners form a circle, facing inward. Each pair of partners begins a conversation on any theme they select. They do not converse with the other pairs of partners. They are then side-coached to close their eyes and continue the conversation as the director and one or more assistants for the exercise move the players outward from the circle, increasing the distance between the conversing pairs, until finally the conversations are taking place across the room with no increase in volume or intensity of the players' voices.
11. Orientation #1 - Spolin, page 62.
12. Circle hello - Alexander, Arena Stage. In this exercise members of the workshop stand in a circle and each in turn greets the other members of the workshop non-verbally.
13. Music contact - Alexander, Arena Stage. In this exercise the student experiences music while maintaining eye contact with a partner.
14. Body lights - Gevanthor, Arena Stage. In this exercise the student is asked to imagine a light source somewhere on his body which he must focus on a point on the floor while moving about.
15. Colors with movement and sound - Alexander, Arena Stage. In this exercise the student is given a color and asked to react physically and vocally to that color on impulse.
16. Objects with movement and sound - Alexander, Arena Stage. This exercise is the same as the one above except the student is given an object to react to.
17. Heavier when full - Spolin, page 71.
18. Part of a whole - Spolin, page 73.
19. Music - High-Low - Gevanthor, Arena Stage. In this exercise the students are asked to respond with physical dynamics to the audible dynamics of the music.
20. Statues - Alexander, Arena Stage. In this exercise one student forms the base of a statue and other students join him to add to the statue. In a variation of this game, a title for the statue is called out and the various participants collectively form a statue of that title.

21. Changing places - Neva Boyd.
22. Random walk - Spolin, page 221.
23. Three changes - Spolin, page 73.
24. Music atmosphere - Gevanthor, Arena Stage. In this exercise each student has a pencil and paper and is asked to sketch a simple floor plan of the environment which the music suggests to him.
25. Silent scream - Spolin, page 239.
26. Good morning - Neva Boyd.
27. I see red - Neva Boyd.
28. Name six - Spolin, page 63.

Group B. Exercises involving imaginary objects.

1. Tug of war - Spolin, page 61.
2. Difficulty with small objects - Spolin, page 67.
3. Involvement with large objects - Spolin, page 77.
4. Physicalizing an object - Spolin, page 78.
5. Space substance - Spolin, page 81.
6. Where through three objects - Spolin, page 119.
7. Transformation of objects - Spolin, page 214.

Group C. Exercises which involve physicalizing the intangible.

1. What's beyond - Spolin, page 102.
2. What time is it - Spolin, page 107.
3. Who's knocking - Spolin, page 110.
4. Weather exercise - Spolin, page 113.
5. Silent tension - Spolin, page 188.
6. Inability to move - Spolin, page 239.
7. Inner life of letters and words - Alexander, Arena Stage. In this exercise each student is given one letter of a noun which the workshop will characterize. He must physicalize and vocalize his impression of the letter. When the whole word is formed, the director side coaches the group with adjectival modifications of the noun which the "word" must then reflect physically and vocally.
8. What will I do for a living - Spolin, page 74.
9. Telephone - Spolin, page 225.
10. Whispered feeling - Gevanthor, Arena Stage. In this exercise, each of two players is given a secret feeling such as happy, nauseated, etc. He is not to mention this feeling directly in conversation, but through indirect conversation and through physicalization to reveal this feeling in his behavior.

Group D. Other non-verbal communication games.

1. Exercise for back - Spolin, page 150.
2. Exploring backs and faces - Gevanthor, Arena Stage. In this exercise, each workshop member explores a partner's back with his own back, eyes closed. He is then side coached to turn and explore the face of his partner with his hands, eyes still closed. Finally, he is coached to open his eyes and look at his partner.

3. Siamese twins - Gevanthor, Arena Stage. In this exercise, partners are chosen and asked to represent Siamese twins at a convention. They may speak only gibberish dialects.
4. How old am I - Spolin, page 68.
5. Monster masks - Alexander, Arena Stage. In this exercise, students are asked to make their face into the face of a monster, and then to let their expression turn them into the total character.

Group E. Non-verbal to verbal transition games.

1. Gibberish - Spolin, page 120.
2. Gibberish store - Gevanthor, Arena Stage. In this variant of Gibberish, one player is the store keeper of a store that sells everything in the world. The second player is a customer who must describe accurately an item which he wishes to purchase.

Group F. Verbal exercises which investigate character.

1. Physical and vocal life of paintings and sculpture - Alexander and Gevanthor, Arena Stage. In this exercise students are asked to bring to life characters they see in paintings and sculptures.
2. Poetry in different atmospheres - Alexander, Arena Stage. In this exercise students are asked to recite the same poem several times, each time imagining they are in a different atmosphere or location.
3. Poetry by different characters - Alexander, Arena Stage. In this exercise, students are asked to recite the same poem several times, assuming each time a different character.
4. Who game - Spolin, page 109.
5. Orientation game #2 - Spolin, page 66.

Group G. Improvisational scene building.

1. Relating an incident - Spolin, page 170.
2. Conversation with involvement - Spolin, page 176.
3. Story ball - Spolin, page 179.
4. Contrapuntal argument A - Spolin, page 180.
5. Contrapuntal argument B - Spolin, page 181.
6. Calling out exercise - Spolin, page 194.
7. Stage whisper - Spolin, page 195.
8. Whisper - Shout - Spolin, page 196.
9. Man on the street A, B & C - Spolin, page 201.
10. Television - Spolin, page 202.
11. Television screen - Spolin, page 215.
12. Who could be there - Gevanthor, Arena Stage. In this exercise, students are given an environment. The first student then acts out a character who might be found in that environment, and successive students join the scene with other logical characters.
13. Group floor tune-in - Gevanthor, Arena Stage. In this exercise, students sit on the floor with eyes closed and are given a specific environment which they are asked to imagine. They are then asked to imagine a specific character within that environment. Finally, they are asked to bring that character to life within that environment.

14. What did you do this morning - Gevanthor, Arena Stage. In this exercise a student is asked to relate an incident in which he participated or which he saw that morning. He is then asked to act out the incident, using other students in the class as characters.
15. "Ings" - Gevanthor, Arena Stage. In this exercise, words such as freezing, smiling, etc. are called out. The workshop is divided in half and students face each other across the room. One group must give the largest physical expression to the word called out, the other the smallest physical expression of it.
16. King and Queen - Gevanthor, Arena Stage. In this exercise, two members of the workshop are selected as King and Queen. The King must then give audience to each of his subjects, determine their particular problems, and attempt to solve them.
17. Animal images - Spolin, page 262.
18. Peddler - Neva Boyd. In this exercise, one student becomes a vendor of wares and attempts to sell them to the other students who are customers.
19. Tell me what happened - Gevanthor, Arena Stage. In this exercise one player tells of something that happened to him. Another player then retells the story while the original player simultaneously acts the story out.
20. Author-Director - Alexander and Gevanthor, Arena Stage. In this most sophisticated exercise, the student brings to the workshop a scenario for a scene which he wishes to direct. He then selects the characters, rehearses the scene, using side-coaching techniques, and finally presents the improvised scene or playlet for the group.

Although the games scale upward from simple exercises involving sensory stimulation in the individual to full-scale theatrical scenes, they need not necessarily be employed in any strict order or sequence. We often find with young children that the attention span on the more elaborate games is much greater than on the more simple. In consequence, after the first few workshop sessions, we have found it fruitful to mix workshop activity between the more simple training exercises such as any of those listed under group A, with more sophisticated exercises up to and including those listed under group G.

Physical Culture of the Theatre - Sets, Properties, Costumes and Lighting

As stated in Chapter I, the physical culture of the theatre is approached in the same improvisational manner as are dialogue and action. This consists of designing workshop problems which require the use of physical elements in their solution, and providing those physical elements for the students to use.

1. Sets. Special set materials were created for use in the workshops. These consisted primarily of a set of cubes 30 inches on an edge, covered on two of the six faces with 1/2 inch plywood in such a way that the two

faces shared a common edge. Smaller cubes enclosed on all six faces with slots cut for handles were also employed. In consequence, the large cube could be used, for example, as a table and a smaller cube as a chair. In addition, the larger cubes could be shoved together to form a platform stage or in such combinations with the smaller cubes as to suggest a boat, an airplane, a cage, a playpen, or any of a variety of shapes which the students quickly visualized. These cubes proved enormously popular and effective, and the inventiveness of the students in arranging them in various ways proved an effective way to engage them with one of the basic ideas of scenic design - the creation of physical environment with a minimum of materials.

In addition, rolls of butcher paper were provided, together with magic marker and other drawing materials which can be used as scenic "soft goods". While it has been our constant observation that one of the immediate results of the improvisational acting workshops is the translation of that experience into visual imagery in the subsequent art classes, the time limitations of the workshop and the high level of activity tend to make this kind of scenic detail impractical as a means of spontaneous expression. It does seem to have value as a method of fixing the experience for the child if opportunity is provided for this kind of reflection at a later date.

Other simple and rudimentary set elements can be provided. For example, a small free-standing book-fold flat, light enough to be handled by the students, is useful and appropriate. In general, however, fewer rather than more scenic elements are desirable, since it is possible for the workshop to become cluttered and for attention to be diverted from the point of focus and concentration to the objects themselves.

2. Properties. By the same token, physical properties in the workshop should be minimized. This is particularly true since much of the work involves, for training purposes, the use of imaginary objects. Therefore the introduction of cups and saucers, books and pencils, brooms and dustpans, etc. tends to negate the work process in many of the exercises. In consequence, properties should be restricted to non-specific elements such as a few pieces of doweling which can double as a spear, a crozier, a window stick, or anything else that the students' imagination is capable of creating from it. Demands of the work will suggest for each specific workshop the kind of properties that will help advance the work. In general, it is our feeling that property elements should be kept to a minimum. It is also our experience that, even when available in relative profusion, they tend not to be used. This is undoubtedly due to the fact that so many games specifically involve the use of imaginary objects.

3. Costumes. In the selection of costumes for the workshop, a variety of clothing and materials can be used. While the costume phase of workshop activity suggests and directly relates to "dress-up" play of

children, it is and should be dissimilar in certain respects. From the standpoint of safety, shoes should not be part of the costume wardrobe. The same holds true for adult-sized dresses or suits. The best results are usually achieved through the use of fabric squares with ties attached to them. Such costume elements are easily converted into capes, muumuus, lava-lavas, mini-skirts, arab ropes, ceremonial gowns, and a host of other designs. A variety of fabric materials with this basic shape, with the addition of a few interesting costume jackets for the boys, is quite sufficient.

Most important is an interesting selection of head-gear. For example, this could include a yachting cap, a baseball cap, a derby, a stovepipe hat, a variety of ladies' hats, a nurse's hat, a helmet, a cowboy hat, an Indian headdress, a military officer's cap, a beret, a turban, a mouseketeer's hat, and so forth. These are ideal costume elements for improvisation, because they help to suggest a character without focusing too much attention or becoming objects of activity in themselves. In addition, other costume elements such as purses, canes, kerchiefs, and so forth may be deemed appropriate and useful by the director of a given workshop.

4. Lighting. In most instances, lighting instruments are not available for use in the public schools. Consequently, improvisational experimentation with this equipment is impossible. Whenever possible, however, students can be encouraged to set up a theatrical environment by modifying whatever the available light in the room may happen to be. For example, by closing off part of the large recreation room at Burning Tree School, and by turning off lights behind the playing area, a surprising degree of visual focus can be obtained. A certain amount of experimentation with existing lighting conditions and facilities can be undertaken. If the workshop is fortunate enough to have at its disposal directional lighting instruments, the students should be allowed to improvise freely with their use, their focus and intensity. This can include the use of color through application of inexpensive theatrical gel materials. Lighting is probably the least accessible element of the physical culture of the theatre available to improvisational workshops: this is no great problem, since it is one of the least important.

5. Sound. A certain amount of experimentation with sound and sound effects can be achieved through the use of bells, clackers, and other noise-making devices commensurate with the level of sound isolation of the workshop from the rest of the school. A tape recorder is a very useful device. It not only enables the children to hear themselves in action, but can itself be used as a source of sound effects. It should be used at the discretion of the workshop director but is an invaluable workshop resource and should by all means be included in the list of equipment.

Also important is a good record player and a supply of interesting records. It is our practice at the beginning of each workshop to introduce

the students into music-filled environment, varying the musical content from day to day or even minute to minute as a means of initial relaxation, an invitation to a pleasant experience. Also, many of the games played in the workshop involve the use of recorded music. Consequently, an adequate record player and supply of records is imperative. In selecting records, care should be taken to include records which are of interest to the students' peer group, as well as records which may stretch his experience, such as classical music, and especially records which will stretch his cultural experience, such as Indian chants, African dance music, sitar or oud music, and in general music from many other cultures.

Other elements for use in the Workshop

1. Paintings. We have found it extremely useful to employ a variety of large color prints of paintings, from representational to impressionistic to realistic, in our workshops. They are most useful as a colorful, visual means of suggesting scenes. A group of student actors is asked to examine and enjoy a painting, and then bring the whole of it or some aspect of it to life in an improvisational scene. Our students constantly surprise us with their level of creativity in this area. Particularly surprising and worthy of attention of workshop directors is the ability of children to abstract qualities from art. Our experience has been that many of the scenes improvised upon realistic paintings are not imitations of the activity contained in the painting, but often center around other activities which capture the quality of the activity of the painting - be it whimsy, anger, violence, suspicion, boy-girl relationships, or what have you.

2. Sound Motion Pictures. We find that many sound motion pictures are particularly stimulating to students in a way that carries over into their improvisational scene work. Most effective in practice have been a selection of films from Canada contained in a catalog of Canadian films and film strips obtainable from the Canadian Embassy, 1746 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington D. C., 20036. Films from this catalog used during the current academic year were "Corral", a film on the Western theme of roping and corraling a spirited horse, "Sky", a visual poem on the astounding spectacle of a day in the life of a sky, "Short and Suite", an animated film inscribed in color directly on the film strip, "Fiddle-de-dee", another color abstract film, "Lines", an experiment in design, "Neighbors", a simple story of love and conflict between neighbors over the possession of a flower growing on their property line, "The Living Stone", a short documentary of Eskimo life, "A Chairy Tale", a fairy tale about a kitchen chair that refuses to be sat on, "The Red Kite", a symbolic tale about how the purchase of a red kite leads to the contemplation of the meaning of life, "Mosaic", an op-art animated film, "Notes on a Triangle", an animation of the single geometric form, and "The Bear and the Mouse", a children's film about a mouse and a bear who help each other.

This is not an exhaustive list of appropriate films, but we have found the source included above to be consistently useful and valuable.

EVALUATION

The peer group evaluation characteristic of normal workshop activity is discussed in Chapter I under "Rationale". In the CAREL-sponsored program for the 1968-69 academic year, a system of codifying the director's evaluation of student activity in the workshops was begun on an experimental basis. The evaluation by the director is inherent in the workshop process, for it is on this basis that he selects the games and concentrates the energies of the student actors. He must be in touch with each individual in the workshop in order to select creatively, from the variety of workshop activities, an activity which will engage that particular individual on his level of need and experience. This same awareness and responsibility underlies the director's preparation of each workshop day. He must reflect on the activities of the previous workshops with attention to the problems or the breakthroughs of each individual member of the workshop. He then selects appropriate improvisational games for the following workshops which will help alleviate the problem or encourage the new developmental aspect of a student's activity.

Virtually all of this evaluation is in terms of the arts and the craft of acting, as described in the first section of this paper. In the professional theatre, much of the evaluation is done intuitively. That is, in most instances a director or teacher does not have a set of evaluative guidelines to which he refers. In practice, the students' activity is seen in relation to the director's artistic and theatrical gestalt. Thus, his evaluation may be fantastically complex even though portions of it may not be verbalized or expressed directly. One of the major problem areas between artists and educators centers on the question of evaluation. Educators understandably would like to have a standardized method of measuring the progress, since most schools and school systems attempt to grade student performance over a given period of time through this method. Most artists, on the other hand, prefer a much more informal method of evaluation, and a looser working structure within which to view student performance. As mentioned above, formal evaluation of professional acting students at the Neighborhood Playhouse is done on the basis of a year's work. This attitude is coming to be looked upon as less bizarre even by the education establishment itself. In the meantime, professional artists working in the schools are often asked to square the circle - to be more specific about their own means of evaluation in terms in which they feel their evaluative process cannot be described. Artists are all less concerned about evaluation as a principle of education, in most instances feeling that it is extraneous to the education process and leads to the imposition of false values upon the student's mind. While the authors of this paper are in essential agreement with this point of view, we have nonetheless attempted to codify to the extent which we feel possible some of the evaluative guidelines which many directors and teachers of theatre use spontaneously in the acting and directing process. We have organized these guidelines into 21 observable

qualities, corresponding to 21 areas of ability in a given student of performer. These abilities are restricted neither to students nor accomplished professionals, but are, we feel, common to the acting process in varying degrees for anyone involved in the art, regardless of his age. These abilities are:

1. Ability to establish a deeper sense of self-confidence within the improvisation.
2. Ability to maintain cooperative group involvement for a sustained period within the improvisation.
3. Ability to follow the first impulse within the improvisation.
4. Ability to connect the first impulse with the dramatic moment within the improvisation.
5. Ability to concentrate on a specific activity within the improvisation.
6. Ability to be affected by people within the improvisation.
7. Ability to be affected by the environment within the improvisation.
8. Ability to be affected by real objects within the improvisation.
9. Ability to be affected by imaginary objects within the improvisation.
10. Ability to make imaginative use of real objects within the improvisation.
11. Ability to physicalize an emotion within the improvisation.
12. Ability to physicalize a thought or idea within the improvisation.
13. Ability to vocalize an emotion within the improvisation.
14. Ability to vocalize a thought or idea within the improvisation.
15. Ability to verbalize an emotion within the improvisation.
16. Ability to verbalize a thought or idea within the improvisation.
17. Ability to discover and understand the behavior of a character within an environment within the improvisation.
18. Ability to transform objects within the improvisation.
19. Ability to transform environments within the improvisation.
20. Ability to transform people within the improvisation.
21. Ability to experience intrinsic enjoyment within the theatre experience.

A list of these 21 observable abilities was mailed to several artists and art educators both European and American. They were: 1. Miss Sudie Bond, originator of the Paperback Players, 441 East 20th Street, New York City - no response. 2. Miss Carol Korty, director of children's theatre, Department of the Theatre, State University College at Brockport, Brockport, New York 11420 - response: general agreement with the 21 abilities listed. An additional suggestion made: "Would it also be possible to observe how much of the child's whole self he is able to involve in his improvisations? This total involvement is most successful when oblique, so that his experiences contribute to the life of the improvisation rather than dictating its direction." 3. Jan and Fabiola Kiuyk, Artistic Directors, Children's Theatre Gashouderstraat, 55B, Roderdam, Holland - response: General agreement with the 21 abilities listed. "The points that you mentioned are important relative to the art and the craft of acting. They are essential,

but not only for actors, but more so for a reasonably happy human existence." 4. Michael Meshke, Artistic Director, Marionetteatern, Stockholm, St. Eriksplan 4-1313-20, Stockholm, Sweden - response: "They have been adopted for a long time in much of European theatre teaching, even if they are not always explained or ordinated in just your way. Their sense is the general material out of which actors are taught". 5. Mr. Edwin Sherin, Director, THE GREAT WHITE HOPE, The Pulitzer Prize Winning Play for 1969, c/o American Conservatory Theatre, 450 Geary Street, San Francisco, California - response: Mr. Sherin responded by telephone, and commented, "I'm not at all certain that you couldn't combine some of those points, particularly since that's the way a director tends to see them, and I'm not certain you haven't left something out on a quick reading. But certainly, what's there is valid, and no major suggestions occur to me at the moment." 6. Mr. Frank Wittow, Artistic Director, Southeastern Academy of Theatre and Music, Inc., 3212 Roswell Road, Atlanta, Georgia - response: "In my opinion all of the abilities listed by the CAREL-Arena Stage Theatre Program are observable by a professional teacher in an acting workshop situation and they are of basic importance to the art of acting. Another area that might be included or explored is the degree to which a student works from his own sense of self - his uniqueness as opposed to expressing himself in terms of pre-set or patterned responses."

Copies of the letters quoted will be found in the appendix.

The improvisational teaching program field staff consisted of directors Robert Alexander and Norman Gevanthor, and program observer and recorder Steveanne Auerbach. The observer prepared written reports on the daily classroom sessions. The two directors taped reports on classroom sessions at frequent intervals, which were then transcribed by the CAREL secretarial staff. In addition, occasional reports from the regular classroom teachers of the workshop students were obtained. All these reports amounted to observations of the workshop activity, and it was from these materials plus day-to-day impressions of the workshop directors that student performances relating to the 21 major abilities were abstracted.

After the first few sessions in each school, six students from each class were chosen for particular observation concerning the 21 major abilities. These six were picked from a wide spectrum of initial workshop activity, from extremely withdrawn to extremely demonstrative. No attempt was made to make day-by-day or week-by-week evaluations of student abilities in these 21 areas, commensurate with our feeling that only arbitrary conclusions can be reached concerning activities over a period of time of less than a year. A more serious problem was encountered, however, on the use of the 21 observable behaviors as an evaluative instrument. This is the fact that the large average size of the classes - 25 - rendered special attention to the selected group impractical, since it became quickly apparent that too much of the director's time and energy would have to be diverted to a very limited spectrum of the work. The problem could be alleviated somewhat by having qualified observers who did not have to participate as directors

in the workshop activity. During the 1968-69 academic year, only one observer was available for all four classes. The observer was herself in a trainee status, and use of the specific 21 points in application to her observations of the activity proved difficult for her. The same problem was encountered with the classroom teachers, although one classroom teacher in her final report did touch on several of the aspects covered in the 21 abilities. Commenting on the children designated in the class at Bancroft School, the classroom teacher remarked: "Gregory has shown improvement in the following directions: his endurance of one task is better; however, his attention span is relatively short. He likes to play. Eugene is very immature. His attention space is very short. He has not learned to follow directions. Donald is very immature and shy. He will participate only when told. His coordination is improving. Annie is a quiet child. She will volunteer to participate in activities now. She also tries to express herself more. She is less shy now. Nadine is still talkative. She likes to participate in games. She has shown talent of improvisation. She follows directions well. Lizzie doesn't listen very well. She's talkative. She will volunteer to participate, but talks very low when attention is focused on her. She trys. In general, the whole class is more verbal. Only a couple of children remain shy since being in this type of program. They will talk and ask anyone questions. They are very cooperative with me and with other special teachers. They are imaginative and creative in telling stories about themselves. Vincent and Shane make up stories daily. As a whole, the boys seem to have advanced more than the girls. Vincent seems very apt in improvisations.

During the regular days of the week, we have listened to stories and illustrated with pictures according to the child's ability. We have used the mirror game, guess what I see, follow the leader, and name an object in the classroom. Also becoming parts of a picture to bring it to life and so forth. Imaginary stories told by the children have been dramatized. They also dramatize stories from books.

I feel that this program has really helped the children in finding values of their own. It has made them aware of themselves and some of their capabilities. I like the program, but I feel a session should be more frequent with shorter time periods. . . . this type of program gives the children a needed outlet. Usually, there isn't enough time at home or school for the child to be heard or his imagination to wander, for experimenting with the inner-self and moving the parts of his body for better control. The activities provoke deep thinking skills. I feel that every city child should have this type of program or a similar type throughout his school career."

In a wrap-up evaluation at the end of the instructional period, which concluded on May 16, 1969, the directors felt that most of their students had shown progress in many or all of the areas outlined under the 21 major

abilities. The unanimous conclusion, however, was that detailed evaluation of individual student behavior on this formal basis would require one or two alternative approaches: smaller classes - with 15 students as an absolute maximum - or the addition of a highly qualified assistant to each program director - perhaps a provisional master teacher - whose sole function it would be to keep very close observation of the designated children.

Our conclusion must be that under the limitations of the present program, detailed and explicit evaluation of a group of designated students is impractical. At the same time, the experience of the last academic year has reaffirmed that this list of 21 observable behaviors in which to look for change is valid.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Rationale. The experience of the CAREL program during the 1968-69 academic year tended to support the basic rationale expressed in this paper. The Arena Stage directors who conducted the program have had a collective thirty years of experience in teaching theatre to young people using this basic approach. In consequence, the program could only be termed experimental in so far as it is an attempt to see if this approach is compatible with the structure of the public school systems. As concerns this point, there are several areas of conflict. First, most public schools do not devote any portion of their regular curriculum day to a course in theatre. This seems to stem from an attitude toward theatre and the arts in general which places them on a very low rung of the educational hierarchy. This feeling is reinforced in practice by the artist's claim - which is our claim as well - that traditional methods of academic evaluation cannot be applied to the teaching of the arts. There exists an acknowledged gap in the development of evaluative instruments in the areas of affective behavior. Perhaps evaluative instruments in the traditional sense are impossible in these areas. At the same time, the process of subjective evaluation constantly takes place in the teaching of art, both by professional artists and by art educators. The inability of artists to express this evaluative mechanism in terms comprehensible to the non-artist educator seems to be a constant source of friction.

2. Teacher Preparation. The CAREL program conducted during the 1968-69 academic year was undertaken without the initial summer workshop for the classroom teachers which we feel is absolutely necessary for the training of teachers who expect to continue this work. The reason for the omission of this summer workshop was economic and not conceptual. Had the CAREL program continued, the classroom teachers whose students participated in the program this year would have participated in a summer workshop in 1969. It is our feeling that it would still have required a year of teaching under observation before these teachers could be presumed to be adequately prepared. Several of the teachers, including the teacher from Garrison Elementary School whose final report is quoted above, demonstrated an intuitive understanding of the process which could have ripened into practical abilities under proper workshop conditions. However, as we have stated, observational process without active participation will not and cannot prepare one to teach. In short, our view of an adequate teacher preparation as outlined earlier in this paper is reinforced.

3. The Schools. A course for theatre in the public schools encounters many administrative difficulties at the very outset. First and foremost, most public schools do not offer a course in theatre, so that the curriculum day must be modified to include time for such a course. This requires the

cooperation, not to say the enthusiastic support, of the principal and the school administration, and of the school board itself. When schools are willing to modify their curriculum day to include such a course, it is not unlikely that the time allotted to such a course will be minimized, as was the case in the current CAREL program. In consequence, the three hours per week which we deemed necessary for the successful operation of the theatre program was reduced to two, and as a result, the program had to be modified into a one-day-a-week operation with a two-hour session. Six days between sessions tends to have a debilitating effect on the operation of the program. Consequently, we reaffirm our belief that a minimum of three hours per week is required for the successful operation of the theatre course and recommend that this time be distributed over two sessions of one and one-half hours each, since, for reasons stated above, a one-hour workshop is impractical.

Another difficulty not easily solved in the public school systems is the size of the average class. It seems to hold whether the school is in the inner-city or the suburbs. Both our past and our present experience lead us to believe that a workshop of more than 15 persons begins to deteriorate in quality. In an ongoing program within a school system, this problem can be solved if the workshop director has as an assistant a qualified trainee. In such instances, the class could be split into two sections and the director could divide his time between the two sessions, leaving the assistant to conduct the workshop for the alternate section. Even with a workshop of 25, a great deal of learning takes place, and it is the unanimous feeling of classroom teachers, the workshop directors, and those administrators involved in the program that the CAREL-Arena Stage theatre program of 1968-69 was valuable. However, if the work is to spread to a significant percentage of the public school population, modifications in design suggested here and in the section on teacher preparation will have to be implemented.

Another problem confronting the workshops in the inner-city schools is lack of adequate space in which to conduct the workshop. As noted above, space limitations in the inner-city forced the elimination of one of the important physcial elements of the workshop - the scenery "cubes". Since by nature the workshop must represent a free and unrestrained atmosphere, the regular classroom environment is not the best place for it. It is possible that with increased administrative cooperation, existing facilities in the inner-city schools could be utilized and a larger and more adequate space could be made available.

4. Workshop content - A Curriculum. There were no major modifications in workshop content during the current program. Workshop content, it must be understood, undergoes constant revision, invention and extension on a day-to-day basis as the director works with his student actors. There was

no marked difference in response to various aspects of workshop activity between inner-city schools and the suburban school. No direct comparison was possible, since the inner-city classes were both first grade and the suburban classes were both third grade. The work in the suburban school tended to be more sophisticated than the work in the inner-city schools, but this can be and we think should be ascribed to the age difference in these two school populations. In general, however, we found that in both environments the students responded more readily and creatively to the more complex improvisational games. Lest this be too much of a surprise, let us state that we feel that the analytical process is not native to the child - he tends to learn this process as he grows older. In consequence, we must keep in mind that we are asking a child to make a conceptual jump when we ask him to participate in a simple exercise which we know, but he may not know, is designed to prepare him for more complex exercises. Among the classroom reports from the schools is one from Bancroft Elementary School in the inner-city in which the director played a series of simple games including "parts of a whole" to very little response from the workshop participants. After a certain degree of random activity, the director invited one of the workshop participants to provide the class with a scenario around which to improvise a play. The result was an elaborate, concentrated, and controlled performance of an improvised scene which centered on a fantastic voyage of a doughty crew in a Jules Verne-like submarine, who were confronted with a series of perils of the sea, including a school of killer sharks who attempted to board the craft. In the creation of this improvised play, the students accomplished many of the concentrated activities which the simpler exercises are designed to teach. This is one of an endless series of examples of the fact that the director must be in constant tune with the student actors and must not escape in a pre-arranged curriculum plan, even on a day-to-day basis.

5. Evaluation. The formal evaluative mechanism failed to function as it was designed, and as discussed above, this factor is a direct result of overload on the workshop director, given the size of the class, and the lack of adequate qualified personnel whose time could be devoted specifically to this function. It is our feeling that this kind of formal evaluation is almost incidental to the program operation. A teacher who is prepared through the system of teacher preparation outlined above will develop a capacity for subjective day-to-day evaluation which is absolutely necessary to the day-to-day teaching of the course. The attempt to abstract from this process the more objective evaluative instrument is not impossible, but a more generous estimate of the amount of qualified personnel time which must be applied to this process is absolutely necessary if this function is to be resumed in future programs.

Finally, we feel that this encounter between the professional theatre and educational research has been valuable. It has made us more aware as artists of the necessity for precision in description of the work process

if one hopes to share that process with a large number of others. It has also proved rewarding, we feel, for the education specialists with whom we and the other program staff have worked. Without the creativity, flexibility and willingness to listen that former program directors Jimmy Nations and Geraldine Dimondstein pioneered and demonstrated in a very difficult "middle man" position, the entire experiment might have deteriorated into a fight between artists and educators. To them and to the present Program Director, Martin Dishart, we wish to express our appreciation and hope for continued cooperation toward the goal of the improvement of the education process.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Of Pertinent Works

1. Boleslavski, Richard. Acting, The First Six Lessons. (New York: Theatre Arts, 1933.)

2. Boyd, Neva. Handbook of Games. (Chicago: H. T. Fitzsimons Co., 1945.)

3. Bruner, Jerome S. The Process of Education. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1966.)

4. Bruner, et. al. Studies in Cognitive Growth. (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 966.)

5. Bruner, Jerome S. Toward A Theory of Instruction. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1966.)

6. Chekhov, Michael. To The Actor. (New York: Hopper, 1953.)

7. Gorchakov, Nikolai. The Vakhtangov School of Stage Art. (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House.)

8. Gorchakov, Nikolai. Stanislavsky Directs. (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1954.)

9. Holt, John. How Children Learn. (New York: Pitman, 1967.)

10. Holt, John. Why Children Fail. (New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1964.)

11. Kretch, David. "The Chemistry of Learning," Saturday Riview, January 20, 1968.

12. McGaw, C. J. Acting is Believing. (New York: Holt-Reinhart, 1966.)

13. MacGowan, Kenneth and Melnitz, William. The Living Stage. (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955.)

14. Moore, Sonya. Stanislavsky System. (New York: Viking Press, 1965.)

15. Piaget, Jean. The Child's Conception of the World, 4th ed. (New York: Humanities Press, 1964.)

16. Piaget, Jean. Judgement and Reasoning in the Child, 4th ed. (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1965.)

17. Piaget, Jean. The Language and Thought of the Child, 3rd ed. (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1965.)

18. Spolin, Viola. Improvisation for the Theatre. (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1963.)

19. Stanislavsky, Konstantin. My Life in Art. (New York: Theatre Arts, 1924.)

20. Stanislavsky, Konstantin. An Actor Prepares. (New York: Theatre Arts, 1936.)

21. Stanislavsky, Konstantin. Building A Character. (New York: Theatre Arts, 1949.)

COPY

T'ING
JONGTEATER

c/o PELSENDIJK 17
STEENBERGEN (N.B.)
THE NETHERLANDS.

Mr. Robert Alexander
Director Theatre Component
CAREL
1200 Seventeenth Street
Washington, D. C. 20036

Dear Mr. Alexander:

You proved once again that America is a very advanced country, in this field. My comment will be greatly influenced by that, because here work like you do is only in its beginning, and the educational situations in both our countries differ greatly. Consequently I have come to believe, that there exists a great difference between Dutch and American children. Things which might go for little Americans might not do for Dutch ones. Our school system is more rigid and old fashioned as yours. So we have to cope with rather agressive workshops. But: in the school system is practically no room for theatre experiments, and there exists a strange and stupid misunderstanding by the "professional" (theatre people) for the tremendous need for theatre-do-it-yourself, and the simply fascinating joy enclosed in this type of theatre.

Our children's theatre, called T'ing Youngtheatre, consists of a still small group of children in the age from 13-17. They do everything themselves, from the play itself to the costumes and sound and light. Our annex activities are workshops for grown-ups in improvisation theatre, the same for children and demonstrations, "theatre days" as we call them for those who ask us. This is the field from which our experiences range.

These are my answers:
1) Yes, but: If you state, for instance, that one of the important factors in learning is a factor of "Readiness", which correspondents to the learning "steps", which is predictable only to the most general level (page 17 of your paper), how do you think you can track the results of those "steps". Working with little children you will seldom witness the moment in which the "ready" psyche accepts some information. This would only be possible when you know the child very, very well and have him in close observation. I have some doubts as to the value of the observations of the observers. Not because I doubt their know-how, but because of the invisibility of the observable "object".

2) The points you mentioned are important relative to the art and craft of acting. They are essential, but not only for actors, but more so for a reasonably happy human existence.

3) No, but I think them somewhat to much in detail. Some are of more importance than others. I should like, for instance, to put No. 21 on top.

Cordially yours,

SIGNED

Fabiola van Dam,
Jan C. B. Kruyk.

COPY

STATE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE AT BROCKPORT/STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
BROCKPORT, NEW YORK 14420

DEPARTMENT OF THEATRE

March 4, 1969

Robert Alexander
Director
Theatre Component
CAREL
1200 Seventeenth Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Dear Mr. Alexander:

Thank you for contacting me about your theatre program for six to nine year old school children. The use of drama with children to develop imaginative powers and expressive skills is an excellent move in the field of education.

I feel the twenty-one check points you list are all valid and observable. Most of them focus on the child's ability to work in the present and to remain actively in contact with his immediate environment. The value of this contact is immense not only for an actor, but, more important, for any productive human being.

Would it also be possible to observe how much of the child's whole self he is able to involve in his improvisations? This total involvement is most successful when oblique, (so that his experiences contribute to the life of the improvisation rather than dictating its direction). For this reason, it is difficult to observe how much the child brings of his current and past life to the scene at hand. However, it seems relevant to have an indication of this ability to integrate activities through drama in addition to abilities to express an emotion or an idea.

Among other things, you mention use of time in your letter. I'm not sure I understand what you have in mind here since your twenty-one points don't specifically deal with this concept.

Aside from these two suggestions, it seems to me as though you've outlined a thorough set of check points, all of which represent very useful skills. I will be very eager to hear the results of your study when you are through. (You may include credit to me, if you wish.) Good luck on the remainder of the project.

Sincerely yours,

SIGNED

Carol T. Korty
Director of Children's Theatre

CTK ksf

COPY

ACADEMY THEATRE
3213 ROSWELL ROAD, N. E. / ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30305 / TELEPHONE 233-9481

February 28, 1969

Dear Bob,

Enjoyed very much reading your material - expecially the brochure for Living Stage-69. It's beautifully done. The Betti speech is one I've used many times in acting classes. The content of the brochure is concise and clear without any unnecessary crapo. It succeeds admirably in expressing who you are and what you're about. I wish you and Ken the greatest success with your project.

As to our present state - we are suffering under severe financial pressure and really struggling. The future holds great promise - it's the present that's a great pain in the ass. We're in rehearsal for "Victims of Duty" by Ionesco and getting ready to create our Third high school show which will be completely different from the one you saw here last year.

My response to your "evaluative criteria" --

In my opinion all of the abilities listed by the CAREL-Arena Stage Theatre program are observable by a professional teacher in an acting workshop situation and they are certainly of basic importance to the art of acting. Another area that might be included or explored is the degree to which a student works from his own sense of self -- his uniqueness as opposed to expressing himself in terms of pre-set or patterned responses.

SIGNED

Best of luck!

Frank

COPY

MARIONETTEATERN

TEATERCHEF - DIRECTION ARTISTIQUE - ARTISTIC DIRECTOR: - MICHAEL MESCHKE
S:T ERIKSPLAN 4 113 20 STOCKHOLM TEL. 312430

Dear Bob Alexander
Arena Stage
Sixth and M Streets Southwest
Washington DC
USA

Toulouse, May 2, 1969

Dear Bob,

Finally I can give you an answer. It has not been easy to me because I travelled a lot and especially I had difficulties to understand the language of the 21 points which therefor had to be translated first. Now I hope that what I found out of it may be useful to you.

I understand that my difficulty of understanding was not only a matter of language but may also be contributed to a somewhat unclear way of saying the points: I mean that certain point touch each other so closely that a synthesy of them, explained in a still easier and clearer way might and should eventually result out of a still more involved reading and restudying. So for example the points 10 and 18.

This is a general critical view. Now as to your 3 questions.

I. Certainly. Not only, they are adopted since long time in much of european theatre teaching, even if they are not always explained or ordinated in just your way. Their sense is the general material out of which actors are teached.

2. They are as important any system can be, with any "systems" eternal limitation of never being a guarantee for making art and being worthless where there is no talent.

3. In my opinion, working much on movement, there is not enough attention paid to the dramatic movement, could be included more precisely.

All together, I think the points (abilities) should be easier to understand, clearer in language, also in order not to touch too close to each other.

But that are my personal little points - forget them, if you don't use them. Excuse this old typewriter in the south of France during a tour... and all my best to you

SIGNED

Michael

v